

**INDIVIDUALISM/COLLECTIVISM,  
CULTURAL IDENTITY, AND SELF-  
ENHANCEMENT:  
A STUDY OF NEW ZEALAND MĀORI**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in  
Psychology, Massey University, Palmerston North**

**Natasha Ann Tassell  
2004**

## ABSTRACT

The present research investigated the associations among individualism/collectivism, Māori cultural identity, self-enhancement and modesty, in a sample of New Zealand Māori. Seventy-one (55 female, 16 male) Māori tertiary education students participated in the study. A series of standard multiple regressions were performed between the dependent variables of horizontal collectivism (HC), horizontal individualism (HI), vertical collectivism (VC) and vertical individualism (VI); and age, self-enhancement, modesty and cultural identity as the independent variables. ANOVA results indicated the present sample had a horizontal collectivist orientation. Additionally, self-enhancement had a significant independent impact on horizontal collectivism when it was used as the dependent variable. Horizontal individualism shared a positive and significant relationship with academic self-enhancement, in addition to significant and negative relationships being found between age and academic self-enhancement. A positive and highly significant relationship was shared between vertical collectivism and modesty. Modesty and the above-average effect shared a significant and negative relationship, as did age and the above-average effect. Despite a number of procedural and measurement limitations, tentative interpretations of the findings were still possible. The implications of the findings are discussed.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I wish thank and dedicate this thesis to my family: Dad, Susan and Phil, and Corey for their constant love, encouragement and support in all aspects of my life.

Immeasurable appreciation and gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Ross Flett, for the unfailing and constant help, expertise, patience, and guidance he has provided to me during the time I have known him.

Warm appreciation to Dr Paul Hirini for his advice, assistance and guidance regarding aspects of Te Ao Māori, which were subsequently incorporated into the present research.

Warm thanks to Dr Ephra Garrett, Jhanitra Murray, Monica Koia, Taniya Ward, and the staff of Te Rau Matatini for their help and support throughout my time at Massey University. Thanks to te whānau o Te Rau Puawai and all the participants who generously gave their time in support of this study.

Special thanks and appreciation to Massey University who financially supported this research via a Massey University Masterate Scholarship for Māori students.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1    Culture and the Self .....	3
1.1.1 <i>Selfways</i> .....	3
1.1.2 <i>Self-Construals</i> .....	4
1.1.3 <i>Individualism and Collectivism</i> .....	6
1.1.4 <i>The Measurement of Individualism and Collectivism</i> .....	8
1.1.5 <i>Evidence for Individualism/Collectivism</i> .....	11
1.2    Cultural Identity .....	13
1.2.1 <i>New Zealand Māori</i> .....	14
1.2.2 <i>Māori Selfways</i> .....	16
1.3    Self-Enhancement.....	19
1.3.1 <i>Relationship with Modesty</i> .....	26
1.4    Overview of the Present Research .....	29
CHAPTER 2 - METHOD.....	33
2.1    Participants.....	33
2.2    Procedure .....	33
2.3    Measures .....	34
2.3.1 <i>Dimensions of Culture</i> .....	34
2.3.2 <i>Cultural Identity</i> .....	35
2.3.3 <i>Self-Enhancement</i> .....	35
2.3.4 <i>Modesty</i> .....	36
2.3.5 <i>Well-Being</i> .....	37
2.3.6 <i>Demographics</i> .....	37
CHAPTER 3 – RESULTS .....	38

3.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	38
3.1.1 <i>Demographics</i> .....	38
3.1.2 <i>Measures</i> .....	38
3.1.3 <i>Individualism/Collectivism Variables</i> .....	39
3.1.4 <i>Self-Enhancement, Psychological Well-Being, and Academic Intentions</i> .....	47
3.1.5 <i>Self-Enhancement and Modesty</i> .....	48
 CHAPTER 4 – DISCUSSION .....	 49
4.1 Findings and Implications.....	49
4.1.1 <i>Individualism/Collectivism, Māori and Cultural Identity</i> .....	49
4.1.2 <i>Individualism/Collectivism and Self-Enhancement</i> .....	53
4.1.3 <i>Self-Enhancement, Psychological Well-being and Academic Intentions</i> .....	55
4.1.4 <i>Self-Enhancement and Modesty</i> .....	58
4.2 Limitations of the Present Research and Suggestions for Future Research.	59
4.2.1 <i>Procedural Limitations</i> .....	59
4.2.2 <i>Variable Limitations</i> .....	60
4.3 Conclusion .....	61
 REFERENCES .....	 633
 APPENDIX A: Information Cover Sheet .....	 722
 APPENDIX B – Questionnaire.....	 744
 APPENDIX C – Scoring for Māori Cultural Identity Measure .....	 855

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Reliabilites, and Score Range Data of Research Variables.....	39
Table 2: Means (and Standard Deviations) of Various Collectivist Samples on the Individualism and Collectivism Subscales.....	40
Table 3: Means (and Standard Deviations) of Various Individualist Samples on the Individualism and Collectivism Subscales.....	41
Table 4: Standard Multiple Regression of Horizontal Collectivism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity, Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), R, R <sup>2</sup> , and Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> (N=53).....	43
Table 5: Standard Multiple Regression of Horizontal Individualism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity, Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), R, R <sup>2</sup> , and Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> (N=53).....	44
Table 6: Standard Multiple Regression of Vertical Collectivism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity, Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), R, R <sup>2</sup> , and Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> (N=53).....	45
Table 7: Standard Multiple Regression of Vertical Individualism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), R, R <sup>2</sup> , and Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> (N=53).....	46
Table 8: Correlations Among Two Self-Enhancement Measures, Positive Affect, Negative Affect, and Overall Psychological Well-Being.....	47
Table 9: Correlations Among Two Self-Enhancement Measures and Academic Intentions.....	48
Table 10: Correlations Among Two Self-Enhancement Measures and Modesty.....	48

## CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

### *How is the self created?*

This is a question that has been the concern of philosophers for centuries, and more recently psychologists. We are all born possessing a unique biological status that will eventually determine our biological characteristics, both internal and external. But, by what means do we come to possess certain traits and personalities, and how is it that we come to think, feel, and consequently behave in certain ways? The cultural environment to which individuals are born and reside within is important for determining such factors, as culture affects peoples thinking, feeling, perceptions and behaviours. Therefore, in order to understand how the self comes to be uniquely constructed, one must first examine the particular culture that the self is embedded in. Whilst every culture is geographically and structurally unique, many cultures, in particular many indigenous cultures, share similar mythologies, traditions, values and norms that have been sustained over a number of centuries, thereby impacting on the contemporary social structures and processes of these cultural groups, and the individuals that reside within them. Given that culture defines the self (Heine, 2001; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder, 1990), and that similarities exist between some cultures, the individual ‘selves’ residing within these particular cultures may also be similar.

Recent times have seen the constructs of individualism and collectivism gain increasing attention within the area of cross-cultural psychology, as they are believed to constitute two very distinct and universal patterns (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Triandis & Suh, 2002). In particular, individualism and collectivism go some way to explaining and capturing the structures that determine cultural differences (Greenfield, 1999). The cultural differences observed across a variety of social phenomena, such as political structures, industries and population health patterns are directly influenced by the dimensions (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995). These constructs also influence a variety of important processes governing individual functioning.

One of these processes is self-enhancement (Kurman, 2003; Kurman & Sriram, 2002), which shares significant relationships with a number of variables important to the beneficial functioning of the individual, including emotional adjustment, psychological well-being, selective memory, and cognitive dissonance. Additionally, self-enhancement is believed to be a universal necessity that has varying impacts on individuals according to the individualist or collectivist pattern characterising a culture.

Whilst individualism and collectivism have been found to exist in a variety of cultural groups, such research has been predominantly conducted on American and Asian samples, with research on other cultural groups being somewhat limited. If individualism and collectivism constitute two distinct cultural patterns, and if they do indeed explain various social and individual processes such as self-enhancement, then research examining their existence in other cultural samples, such as the New Zealand Māori, and the relative impact that they may have on these cultural samples, is imperative.

With this in mind, the focus of this thesis will be firstly, to provide an overview of how the self is initially constructed by culture through the transmission of selfways (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999), and how these selfways eventually determine the way in which the self is construed or viewed. An explanation of how the self-construals (Singelis, Bond, Sharkey, & Siu Yiu Lai, 1999) of individuals translate into the cultural patterns of individualism and collectivism will be given, as well as a critique of the measurement approaches utilised by research assessing the patterns, and the subsequent findings of this research. Cultural identity, as a concept will then be discussed, with a specific focus being given to Māori cultural identity. The underlying selfways of the Māori culture will be described, prior to an explanation of how these selfways characterise Māori as possessing a collectivist cultural pattern. Self-enhancement, believed to be determined by individualism and collectivism will be also defined, with a critique being provided of research examining the variable. The concept of modesty (Cialdini, Wosinka, Dabul, Whetstone-Dion, & Heszen, 1998) will be discussed in relation to self-enhancement, in addition to the impact that both self-enhancement and modesty may have on Māori as a

collectivist culture. Finally, a summary will be presented and the goals of the research will be specified.

## **1.1 Culture and the Self**

Culture is a socially constructed term that is conceptualised in a variety of ways, and exists both externally and internally to individuals. External to the individual, culture exists in the form of human-made institutions, such as religion, politics, and education; whilst internally culture is reflected in the form of shared beliefs, values, norms and interactions (Singelis et al., 1999). These internal and external aspects of culture inevitably have implications for an individual's perception of themselves and their situation. Indeed, much in the psychological literature suggests that culture and the self are intimately interwoven. That is, the self is shaped by the wider culture, and in turn plays a part in shaping the wider culture, making each "mutually constitutive" (Heine, 2001, p. 7; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder, 1990).

### **1.1.1 Selfways**

The self is shaped by the wider culture through the transmission of information parcels known as selfways. Selfways may be defined as "the communities' ideas about being a person and the social practices, situations, and institutions of everyday life that represent and foster these ideas" (Heine et al., 1999, p. 768). These ideas include cultural mandates about what it is to be an appropriate, good and moral person, as reflected in the significant narratives, texts, symbols, and icons of the culture. Essentially, selfways are the cultural norms that dictate how others are expected to be treated by the self and how the self is expected to act when participating as a member of the cultural group (Heine et al., 1999; Sedikides, Gaertner, & Toguchi, 2003). It is through this participation and engagement in the understandings, traditions and customs of the cultural group that the self is inevitably shaped. That is, the individual comes to define and view themselves in a way that is reflective of these underlying selfways. These definitions and views, or self-construals, underlie all unconscious processes and consequently impact and even determine all aspects of an individual's

functioning. An overview of the relationship between selfways and self-construals is provided in the following discourse.

### **1.1.2 Self-Construals**

Believed to be directly influenced by selfways, self-construal's may be defined as "a constellation of thoughts, feelings, and actions concerning the relation of the self to others and as distinct from others" (Singelis et al., 1999, p. 316). When an individual's thinking, feeling, and acting are congruent with the dominant selfway, they are more likely to be repeated and retained, as they produce responses that are congruent with the wider cultural environment. This congruence with the wider cultural environment reinforces the expressed self construal, eventually enabling it to become a part of the individual's stable psychological structure, and consequently shape the wider cultural environment (Heine et al., 1999; Sedikides et al., 2003).

Given that cultures are divergent, the self-construals of individuals that comprise and therefore shape various cultures will also be divergent. Markus and Kitayama (1991) proposed two differing types of self-construal that have implications for, and have an effect on the cognitions, emotions and motivations of individuals. These are the *independent* self-construal and the *interdependent* self-construal.

When construed independently, the self is viewed as bounded, distinct and separate from other selves, and defined in terms of its' unique personal attributes, traits, and characteristics (Harrington & Liu, 2002; Markus & Kitayama, 1994). The independent self has control and is responsible for behaviour, initiating actions in order to meet specific needs. The main objective underlying this type of construal is the maintenance of independent beliefs, through the discovery and fulfilment of needs, wants, and desires, and the achievement of personal goals, with well-being and value often being determined by an ability to conquer unique personal feats. Whilst not separated entirely from the in-group, relationships to the in-group are determined by, and exist primarily to meet the needs of the independent self (Harrington & Liu, 2002; Markus & Kitayama, 1994). Subsequently, social relationships tend to be

voluntary, contractual, and largely determined by the perceived advantages or disadvantages that they present for fulfilling and maintaining autonomy (Jetten, Postmes, & Mcauliffe, 2002; Markus & Kitayama, 1994; Schwartz, 1990; Strunk & Chang, 1999).

According to the interdependent view, the self exists and is defined only in terms of its' relationships with and connectedness to, significant others (Harrington & Liu, 2002). The interdependent self engages in collectively appropriate actions and behaviours and is motivated to adjust and fit into relationships that are perceived as important (Markus & Kitayama, 1994), with value being placed on the ability to maintain these relations and promote the collective. Consequently, primary importance is given to the relationship between the self and others, with the main objective of maintaining harmonious and mutually beneficial relations and feelings of interdependence, particularly with those perceived as being in-group members (Jetten et al., 2002; Markus & Kitayama, 1994). Given this, the needs, wants, and desires of the interdependent self are determined by a consideration of others reactions, therefore becoming secondary to the needs, wants, and desires of others in the group (Kashiyama, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand, & Yuki, 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; van Baaren, Maddux, Chartrand, de Bouter, & van Knippenberg, 2003).

Triandis (1989) and others (e.g., Singelis et al., 1999) have suggested that these two types of self-construal are inherent to all individuals, but it is the underlying selfways that determine the accessibility to and degree of expression of a dominant type (Kashima et al., 1995). Given that selfways originate from and are specific to communities, individuals residing within the same communities or within close proximity will share the same selfway, and therefore possess the same type of self-construal. This in turn would create a group of individuals that think, feel and behave in similar ways, as determined by the specific type of self-construal that is possessed. A proposed explanation for this group behaviour is the dimensions of culture, most notably known as the constructs of *individualism* and *collectivism*. The following section provides a description of the proposed relationship between self-construals and the dimensions of culture.

### 1.1.3 Individualism and Collectivism

The dimensions of *individualism* and *collectivism* are to date, the most predominantly studied characteristic of culture (Singelis et al., 1999), and are believed to be synonymous with the two types of self-construal proposed by Markus and Kitayama (1991). In particular, the individualist cultural pattern results when the independent type of self-construal predominates in and is characteristic of a group of individuals. Consequently, individualist cultures tend to encourage and promote autonomy and independence of individuals. The collectivist cultural pattern results when the interdependent type of self-construal is prevalent in and characteristic of a group of individuals, resulting in a tendency for interdependence with and obligation to significant others being encouraged in collectivist cultures (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002).

Individualism and collectivism have been conceptualised as extreme dimensions on a continuum (Triandis & Suh, 2002), and constitute two distinct cultural patterns (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). However, Triandis (1990, 1995) suggests that rather than being extremes or dichotomies, individualism and collectivism are instead multidimensional. For example, he proposed that American individualism is different from Swedish individualism, and that Korean collectivism is different from that of the Israeli Kibbutz. Such a proposal seems plausible given the diversity of selfways and the subsequent self-construals that result in these cultural patterns. A proposed explanation for such differences suggests that individualism and collectivism may be comprised of two sub-dimensions - vertical and horizontal. That is, verticality is characterised by hierarchy and differentiation, whilst the horizontal dimension is typified by equality and similarity (Gushue & Constantine, 2003; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). When combined with individualism and collectivism, these dimensions form four apparent cultural patterns.

In cultures characterised by *horizontal individualism* (HI), individuals want to be independent and distinct from their in-group, however, they do not wish to acquire any particular hierarchical status. Uniqueness, whilst still maintaining a sense of equality with others, is the focus for individuals within these cultures (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). *Vertical individualists* (VI) also wish to remain

independent and unique. They are oriented toward achieving status and hierarchy, often succeeding through competition with others. A recent study found that an American sample scored higher on vertical individualism in comparison to a Danish sample that scored higher on horizontal individualism when assessed utilising the Singelis et al. (1995) measure (Nelson & Shavitt, 2002). Such results indicate that these dimensions are existent in these sample populations.

In *horizontal collectivist* (HC) cultures, an orientation toward interdependence, similarity, and equality exists among individuals. Importance is placed on group goal achievement, which is attained through cooperativeness of group members, rather than compliance to authority figures. Again, utilising the Singelis et al. measure a sample of Israeli Kibbutz scored higher than Urban Israeli's on the dimension of horizontal collectivism, thereby lending support to the existence of the cultural dimension (Kurman & Sriram, 2002). Lastly, *vertical collectivist* (VC) individuals are interdependent, placing particular significance on in-group integrity. They tend to be dutiful, often forsaking individual goals for those of the in-group (Gouveia, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2003; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Recent studies utilising the Singelis et al. measure in two different sample populations of Singaporeans indicated that the groups scored higher on vertical collectivism, in comparison to samples of Kibbutz Israeli's, Urban Israeli's, and Americans (Kurman & Sriram, 2002; Soh & Leong, 2002).

Given that research has found evidence for the existence of these cultural patterns in a variety of cultural groups, an examination of the measurement approaches utilised for such research is essential for ascertaining the effectiveness, appropriateness, reliability, and validity of the approaches and also the research in which they have been utilised. Therefore, the following section provides an overview and critique of the approaches predominantly used for measuring the dimensions of culture.

#### **1.1.4 The Measurement of Individualism and Collectivism**

According to Oyserman et al. (2002), empirical evaluation of the existence of these cultural dimensions is often done utilising three specific approaches. The first of these is known as *applying Hofstede*. In research utilising this method, the country-level ratings noted by Hofstede (1980) are used as substitutes for individualism, rather than the dimension being measured directly. Assumed to be equivalent to low individualism, the dimension of collectivism is also not measured. The major limitation to this approach is that neither dimension is directly measured (i.e., using a measurement scale), creating difficulties in ascertaining whether the dimensions do actually exist within the specific study samples. Therefore, the approach will not be the focus here.

The second approach, known as *direct assessment* measures the cultural dimensions at the individual level and usually involves participants responding on a Likert-type rating scale to a series of statements regarding values, attitudes, and beliefs. This approach to examining individualism and collectivism suffers from a number of limitations, the first of which concerns the type of information that is being accessed. Such measures are based on the assumption that the dimensions of culture are a “form of declarative knowledge” able to be expressed, rather than implicit knowledge based on an embedded form of social practices and configurations that constitute the basis of daily living and experiences (Oyserman et al., 2002, p. 7). Given that the expression of individualist or collectivist characteristics is determined by cultural selfways which underlie all unconscious processes and influence functioning, then they are indeed a form of implicit knowledge and such a limitation is plausible. Equally plausible though is the fact that implicit knowledge may be expressed in any of a variety of ways including verbal, written, behavioural and attitudinal. So the dimensions of culture do indeed constitute a form of declarative knowledge able to be expressed in the form of statements, such as those utilised in individualism/collectivism measures, thereby raising doubt as to whether this factor is a limitation.

The assumption that responses to scale items are perceived as having the same meaning cross-culturally is another limitation. That is, how can researchers be

sure that a response of “very good” will be similarly understood by participants from America and China. Theoretically, however, such a limitation should only apply to samples in which the individualism/collectivism measure utilised is composed in a language that is secondary to the specific participant population (e.g., when a Japanese sample responds to a measure written in English), as misinterpretation may occur during the process of translation. Presumably then, studies that utilise individualism/collectivism measures that are composed in a language that is primary to the sample participants should not suffer from this limitation, as although the words used to describe various objects may differ between countries that speak the same language, the types of response statements utilised in most individualism/collectivism measures (e.g., “agree”, “disagree”) are quite specific, leaving little room for misinterpretation. A further concern relates to whether the response statements of some of these measures (e.g., “very good”, “excellent”) have the same meaning psychologically for individuals. Recent research suggests that the assumption of congruence in meaning is indeed difficult to make (Ji, Schwarz, & Nisbett, 2000). However, given that the measures are assessing individual differences across the dimensions, and that reliable correlations have been found between scores on the measures and other variables (e.g., culture, self-enhancement), then the measures must be tapping into some underlying psychological processes in a systematic way (R. Flett, personal communication, September 10, 2004). That is, the response statements (which determine the scoring of measures and the resulting analyses) must to some degree share similar meanings psychologically for individuals.

Similarly, a final limitation concerns the issue of whether the same items or questions are assessing the underlying dimensions of individualism and collectivism when used cross-culturally. Few studies to date have examined the cross-cultural equivalence of the measurement items utilised in assessing the elements that comprise individualist and collectivist patterns in different countries. However, in their meta-analysis of 27 different rating scales used to measure the concepts of individualism and collectivism, Oyserman et al. (2002) found that the element consensually agreed upon across all studies to define individualism was the valuing of independence. For the concept of collectivism,

the element was a sense of duty and obligation to the in-group. Such findings suggest that different cultures may possess underlying selfways that are similar with respect to determining the expression of individualism and collectivism, and the items utilised in the majority of individualism/collectivism measures are representative of these. Presumably then, such items must also be cross-culturally equivalent in terms of their ability to assess the dimensions of individualism and collectivism.

The third approach to measuring individualism and collectivism are *priming studies*. These studies involve inducing and making salient individualist and collectivist values or worldviews by focussing experimental participant's attention on, but not measuring directly, aspects of either dimension (e.g., having participants read collectivist statements such as: "I would sacrifice my own good for that of my in-group"). Participants then complete a relevant rating scale (i.e., Singelis et al. (1995) individualism/collectivism scale), and responses are compared to those of a control group who have not been primed for individualism/collectivism, thus allowing inferences about causality to be made. That is, differences in the strength of individualism/collectivism dimensions between groups are presumed to be determined by the endorsement of the primed cultural values or worldviews, suggesting that situational determinants are responsible for the expression of individualism and collectivism. However, the approach does not assess whether individualism or collectivism is inherent to individuals and has a general influence on behaviour irrespective of the situation, making its use in the present study redundant.

As has been demonstrated, none of the measurement approaches discussed is without fault, and each has a number of associated strengths and weaknesses. However, one of the approaches, direct assessment, has consistently provided results indicating the existence of the dimensions of culture across various nations, and the existence of significant correlations with a number of variables. A discussion of the findings of research that has utilised the method is provided in the following section.

### **1.1.5 Evidence for Individualism/Collectivism**

None of the previously discussed measurement approaches dominates individualism/collectivism research. However, despite the limitations, numerous studies utilising the direct assessment approach have provided examples of the existence of individualist/collectivist patterns in differing nations. For instance, using the individualism/collectivism measure developed by Singelis et al. (1995), Thomas and Perkerti (2003) found a sample of Indonesian employees had a higher mean score on the vertical collectivism dimension than on any of the other dimensions. Two separate studies of Singaporean high school students (Kurman & Sriram, 2002) and Singaporean university students (Soh & Leong, 2002) found both samples scored higher on vertical collectivism than on any of the other four dimensions. In their studies utilising both the Singelis et al. measure and a combination of in-depth interviewing combined with scenario-based structured scales, Nelson and Shavitt (2002) found Americans scored higher on vertical individualism and Danes scored higher on horizontal individualism, than on any of the other dimensions. A study by Gouveia et al. (2003) revealed a higher mean score on the horizontal collectivism dimension in comparison to the other dimensions, for a Spanish sample. Using both the Singelis (1994) and Singelis et al. (1995) measures, Asian Americans and African Americans were found to score higher on collectivism than European Americans (Coon & Kemmelmeier, 2001).

In spite of the limitations associated with the direct assessment approach, research findings indicating the existence of individualism/collectivism in various nations have been shown to be fairly consistent. What's more, the studies mentioned above have all utilised the same direct assessment measure (i.e., Singelis et al., 1995), and produced reliable results, which suggests that the Singelis et al. measure may indeed be an effective means for measuring the dimensions of individualism and collectivism.

Despite this conclusion, Oyserman et al. (2002) in their meta-analyses suggested that research findings observing cross-national cultural differences in individualism and collectivism are still not as conclusive as may be expected, for a number of reasons. Firstly, the majority of studies have been conducted

utilising American or Western European and East Asian (predominantly Japanese, Hong Kong, Korean, and Peoples Republic of China) samples. Some research has been conducted on other sample populations however, determining the specific implications of differences in individualism and collectivism for these nations is limited by the insufficient quantity of studies available to make reliable comparisons. Consequently, the intent of the present study is to make a useful contribution to the topic area, by providing information on an alternative population sample (Māori). Additionally, the majority of studies have been conducted with U.S. minority groups (e.g., African Americans, Asian Americans, Latin Americans), with too few studies being conducted with samples from countries which American minority groups originate. Consequently, it is uncertain whether a residing Spanish (a Latin country) population can be categorised as collectivists just because Latin Americans score highly on collectivism. That is, the lack of research data makes it difficult to conclude that the cultural orientation of ethnic groups residing in different nations will be the same. Similarly, Oyserman et al. found that the effect sizes of East Asian individualism/collectivism studies were not consistent, indicating that Asian countries do not share the same degree of cultural orientation, as is often assumed.

Given these limitations, it is difficult to ascertain whether the dimensions of individualism and collectivism are stable constructs that exist universally. However, some studies seemingly contradict such criticism as their findings have noted the existence of individualism and collectivism in a variety of other (non-Asian and American) nation samples. For instance, Gouveia et al. (2003) found a sample of Spanish participants scored higher on collective and horizontal dimensions than on vertical or individual dimensions, utilising the Singelis et al. (1995) measure. In their study, Thomas and Perkerti (2003) found a sample of New Zealand employees to have a cultural profile characteristic of horizontal individualists. Similarly, Australians were found to have higher mean scores for individualism in comparison to Koreans, Japanese and Hawaiians, when assessed utilising Yamaguchi's Collectivism Scale (1994; cited in Kashima et al., 1995). A self-descriptive method (Bochner, 1994) also revealed that Australian and British participant's self-descriptions were more

individualistic than those of Malaysian participants, who were more collectivistic. In addition to these cross-national differences, discrepancies in individualism and collectivism have been found between cultural groups residing in the same country. For instance, utilising the Singelis et al. measure, urban Israeli's were found to score higher on measures of individualism in comparison to kibbutz Israeli's who scored higher on horizontal collectivism (Kurman & Sriram, 2002), indicating that cultural differences within nations exist also.

Whilst the dimensions of individualism and collectivism need further investigating before definitive conclusions regarding universality can be made, these findings show that the dimensions of culture do exist in nations that have been researched. As previously mentioned, individualism and collectivism are believed to be the consequence of groups of individuals possessing an independent or interdependent self-construal, which ultimately results from the underlying selfways. Based on this, the expression of individualism or collectivism must be dependent on the extent to which individual's endorse the specific selfways of a community or culture. Stated differently, the degree to which one identifies with or affiliates to a specific culture (or the degree of cultural identity) should in theory determine the expression of individualism and collectivism in cultures. An exploration of the components that comprise and define the concept "cultural identity" may assist in determining if this is indeed realistic. Focussing on Māori cultural identity, the relationship between the dimensions of culture and cultural identity is discussed in the following section.

## **1.2 Cultural Identity**

Cultural identity is a subjective classification or choice of affinity to the specific selfways of a group (Gouveia, de Albuquerque, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2002; Gurung & Mehta, 2001). Often a fundamental aspect of an individual, cultural identity involves relatedness through social and symbolic ties and the sharing of prescribed cultural beliefs, values, norms, and interactions (Durie, 2001; Gurung & Mehta, 2001). It can be a salient aspect of an individual's sense of self and

sense of others, and may be derived from any of a variety of factors including, religion (e.g., Jewish, Islam, Hindu, Mormon), sexuality (e.g., bisexual, homosexual, lesbian, transvestite), and ethnicity (e.g., African American, Asian, Hispanic, Pakeha). Given the ever-evolving nature of global industries (e.g., tourism) and technologies (e.g., transportation), and increasingly changing immigration patterns, cultural diversity is common in many nations. Of particular significance is the increasing diversity of ethnic groups that comprise the populations of many countries. An example of a nation in which ethnic groups are becoming more varied is New Zealand, whereby the ethnic make-up is comprised predominantly of Pākehā, Māori, Pacific Island, and Asian individuals (Ministry of Social Policy, 2001). In terms of the nature of the present research, interest centres on the cultural identities of the Māori ethnic population, and therefore will be the focus here.

### **1.2.1 New Zealand Māori**

Whilst considered the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Māori are a numerical minority in their own country, constituting 14% of the total population at the time of the 2001 census (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). Given the cultural variation of the contemporary New Zealand population, the expressed cultural identities of modern Māori are now as diverse as that of other New Zealanders (Bennett, 2001). In fact, exactly what constitutes a Māori cultural identity is difficult to determine and the subject of much debate in social science circles. For instance, interviews conducted with young Māori identified four main areas in which Māori cultural identity was believed to be based, these included: being on the marae; being in households where whānau regularly gather; when Māori is heard or spoken; and in kapahaka performances (Sawicka, Barr, Grace, Grenside, Thomson, & Williams, 1998).

Similarly, The Social Report 2003 (Ministry of Social Development, 2003) also used four indicators of Māori identity. However, they differ slightly from those identified by Sawicka et al. (1998). The first, participation in cultural and arts activities, was used because artistic endeavours often partly define and contribute to cultural identity. The second of the indicators, the proportion of Māori language speakers, was used as language is central to cultures and

subsequently contributes to cultural identity. The proportion of Māori children receiving Māori medium education was the third indicator utilised as a predictor of Māori language survival and success in future generations. The fourth indicator, local content programming on television, was utilised as a measure of the strength of cultural identity (Ministry of Social Development, 2003).

Four identity determinants and associated identity markers were used in the Te Hoe Nuku Roa baseline study (Te Hoe Nuku Roa Research Team, 1999), to reflect “affiliation, knowledge, behaviour...[and] access to the institutions and resources” of the Māori culture (Durie, 2001, p. 55). The determinants and markers used included: self-identification (identity markers of ethnic affiliation and tribal affiliation); access to cultural resources (Māori language knowledge and skills, tikanga Māori knowledge and skills, marae participation); access to Māori physical resources (Māori land, fisheries, wahi tapu, tribal estates); and, access to Māori cultural resources (whānau, friends and associates, Māori educational institutions, Māori services, tribal services). The degree to which these determinants were endorsed was reflective of what the researchers argued were secure, positive, notional, or compromised Māori cultural identities. A secure identity is representative of ready access to most aspects of the Māori world, including language, land and whakapapa. A positive identity is reflective of a strong dedication to being Māori, however, access to aspects of the Māori world are limited. Similarly, a notional identity is reflective of limited or no access to aspects of the Māori world, however, an affiliation to Māori is present. Lastly, a compromised identity is reflective of little or no affiliation to Māori (Durie, 2001).

In a more recent study, Murray and Flett (2003) developed an extended version of the Te Hoe Nuku Roa (1999) measure. Whilst similar in content, the extended version of the measure was designed to capture the notion of a Māori cultural identity in a different way that does not categorise identities as secure, positive, notional, or compromised. Items included in the measure reflected knowledge of ancestry, customs, and language; involvement with and access to whānau, marae, and social contacts; and, self-identification. Such items were perceived to

be determinants of a Māori cultural identity, with higher levels of knowledge and exposure being indicative of an increased sense of Māori cultural identity.

As the highlighted examples indicate, there is no sure or exact method, or general consensus for how Māori cultural identity can be empirically determined. However, the measures utilised in the aforementioned studies suggest that there are some common aspects (e.g., language, social contacts, self-identification) that appear to be essential, at least from a research perspective, for determining an individual's level of identity. Therefore, the greater exposure an individual has to these aspects of Māori culture, the higher the probability being that the individual will also feel increased affinity to the culture, and therefore will be more likely to exhibit a greater sense of Māori cultural identity.

As previously stated, cultural identity is essentially an affiliation to and sharing of prescribed beliefs, values, norms, and interactions that result from cultural selfways (Durie, 2001; Gurung & Mehta, 2001), with the degree of cultural identity essentially determining the expression of individualism and collectivism in cultures. Therefore, in order to estimate the particular cultural pattern (i.e., individualism/collectivism) that is likely to be prevalent in the Māori culture, an examination of the underlying selfways composing Māori cultural identity is necessary. Although an extensive overview of **all** of these selfways is difficult to ascertain, a number of selfways were historically predominant in guiding and governing the traditions and customs of Māori society, and thus will be the focus here.

### **1.2.2 Māori Selfways**

Perhaps the most obvious of these selfways inherent to Māori is that relating to the whānau (extended family), or *whanaungatanga*. This selfway serves to provide each whānau member with a sense of belonging and obligation to each other. Whanaungatanga facilitates the unity and strength of a whānau, not only among whānau members, but also with wider groups associated to the whānau such as iwi and hapū (Henare, 1988; Metge, 1995). This selfway “becomes manifest through collectively beneficial behavioural interaction[s]” (Hirini,

1996, p.49), such as emotional, spiritual and material caring and sharing with other whānau members (P. Hirini, personal communication, July 1, 2004). Such an act allows connections to be made to each other through common kinship, thereby binding Māori together, creating a sense of oneness, and emphasising the collective needs of the culture.

Complimentary to this is the selfway of *kotahitanga*, literally translated as oneness. It elaborates on the concept of whanaungatanga, suggesting that the well-being of the whānau (of which the individual is a part), and thus the Māori people, is reliant on all members supporting and uplifting the common good and well-being (Henare, 1988). Participation in whānau, iwi, or hapū functioning is optional, and some members will be more or less active than other members (P. Hirini, personal communication, July 1, 2004). However, all members are expected to enhance the collective, which often requires the subordination of one's own needs for that of the group. An example of the behavioural manifestation of kotahitanga is the notion of *tohatoha*, which emphasises the fair distribution of material things among members of society (Henare, 1988). Many Māori still actively practice tohatoha, with the most frequent example being the sharing of resources across uniquely Māori social institutions (i.e., tangihanga). Tohatoha emphasises the social responsibility that each member has to all other members of the society of which they are apart.

The selfway of social reciprocity, or *utu*, underlies all dealings within Māori society. Essentially, utu suggests that anything received must be incrementally repaid. Most precisely, the term is a reference to the restoration of social 'balance' (P. Hirini, personal communication, July 1, 2004). An example of the manifestation of this selfway is at tangihanga where the most immediate relatives of the deceased (i.e., the whānau pani) are left to mourn, whilst members of the wider whānau take responsibility for other arrangements (such as the feeding and bedding of guests). It is then expected that the mourning whānau will assume the same responsibilities when a death occurs within the extended whānau. Unity among whānau members ensures this selfway is actively manifested, with personal sacrifices often being made to ensure the repayment of anything that is owed (Henare, 1988; Metge, 1995). Such

repayments ensure that relationships among and between whānau remain harmonious, fulfilling, and mutually beneficial both in the present and throughout future generations.

The final selfway to be discussed is that of mana. Often regarded as especially salient among Māori, mana is a complex concept that may take many forms. However, in its general form mana may be defined as authority, or pertaining to authority or social status (Durie, 2001). Māori construe other Māori as representatives of their people and measure them in terms of their ability to promote the collective mana (i.e., whānau, hapū (sub-tribe), and/or iwi (main tribe) status). This selfway becomes manifest when an individual is perceived as possessing specific traits that denote the well-being of the collective. Whilst individuals may be bestowed with mana, they cannot take it for themselves as this would be considered whakahīhī (arrogant, egotistical). Consequently, the possession of mana can only be fully understood in the context of the individual's harmonious relations to his or her whānau, hapū, and iwi (Henare, 1988). The term mana has gained considerable use within the general public, especially within the mass media. Although commonly understood by New Zealanders as referring to secular authority, social status or leadership prowess, the customary use of the word mana in the Māori language has meaningful spiritual connotations, the subject of which is beyond the scope of the present research (P. Hirini, personal communication, July 1, 2004).

Based on these descriptions of the predominant underlying selfways inherent to Māori, an assumption would be that as a culture Māori are collectivists. That is, these selfways appear to map very closely onto aspects that are generally characteristic of an interdependent self-construal (e.g., importance placed on unity, connectedness and relationships to significant others, collectively appropriate behaviours, own needs secondary to others, etc), which are principally possessed by individuals comprising a collectivist culture. What's more, the behaviours reflective of the selfways of whanaungatanga, kotahitanga, and utu are characteristic of those behaviours expressed by vertical collectivists (significance placed on in-group integrity, dutifulness, forsaking individual goals for that of the in-group, etc). Presumably then, individuals who strongly

affiliate and ascribe to these selfways should be more likely to possess high levels of Māori cultural identity, and should therefore also be more likely to possess collectivist characteristics, specifically vertical collectivist characteristics. Alternatively, individuals who affiliate and ascribe less strongly to these selfways should be less likely to possess high levels of Māori cultural identity, and consequently should be less likely to possess collectivist attributes.

A number of significant relationships have been noted between the dimensions of individualism/collectivism and a variety of psychological variables, such as embarrassability (e.g., Singelis et al., 1999), authoritarianism (e.g., Kimmelmeier, Burnstein, Genkova, Kanagawa, Hirshberg, Erb, Wiczorkowska, & Noels, 2003), and self-enhancement (e.g., Kurman, 2003; Kurman & Sriram, 2002). In particular, self-enhancement has been increasingly researched in recent years, with findings from a number of studies indicating that levels of self-enhancement are high in individualist samples, in comparison to collectivist samples which have lower levels of self-enhancement. Given that the New Zealand Māori may indeed be a collectivist culture, the findings of low self-enhancement that have been noted in other collectivist cultures may also be apparent for Māori culture. Specifically, such relationships should be more apparent for individuals possessing a high level of Māori cultural identity as presumably they will score higher on the collectivist dimension, than for those individuals possessing lower levels of Māori cultural identity. Therefore, an exploration of the self-enhancement construct and its relationships with the dimensions of culture and Māori cultural identity is provided in the following section.

### **1.3 Self-Enhancement**

Sometimes referred to as the opposite of self-criticism, self-enhancement may be defined as a “mechanism that protects one’s self-concept from negative information” (Kurman, Yoshihara-Tanaka, & Elkoshi, 2003, p. 25) through the preservation of subjectively positive beliefs and emotions, irrespective of their objective nature. Research examining self-enhancement typically explores the

ways in which individuals rate themselves with regard to specific traits or behaviours, and often compares these ratings with some objective measure of the specified traits or behaviours (Heine & Lehman, 1997). Results of such studies often show that most people rate themselves positively, and when these ratings are compared to external criteria they are generally more positive than the objective measures indicate.

However, concerns have been noted with regard to the valid measurement of self-enhancement using such a method. In particular, previous researchers (e.g., Assor, Tzelgov, Thein, Ilardi, & Connell, 1990; Kenny & Albright, 1987) have indicated some difficulties with finding valid external criteria that can be utilised for the assessment of self-enhancement. For example, self-ratings of academic ability are often compared to an individual's actual academic grades. Whilst this appears to be a reasonable assessment of how an individual may view their abilities, how can one be certain that this is a sure indicator of an individual's tendency to self-enhance? That is, if an individual positively rates them self in terms of academic ability and a comparison of their academic grades indicates that such a rating is indeed true, how can one ascertain that the rating is indicative of a tendency to self-enhance and not just a realistic assessment of the individual's ability? Alternatively, if an individual rates their academic ability positively but their academic grades indicate that the rating is an excessively positive assessment with no basis in reality, how can one be sure that this is a rating indicative of self-enhancement and not indicative of, for example, the self-aggrandizement characteristic of individuals with narcissistic personality disorder (Kaplan & Sadock, 1998)? Presumably, the two types of ratings result from differences in aspects of the psychological functioning of individuals (R. Flett, personal communication, September 10, 2004), which are unrelated to an ability to maintain a positive appraisal of oneself. However, consensus regarding the underlying meanings of the two types of assessment, and which type best constitutes and accurately captures the concept of self-enhancement, is lacking. Given that the majority of researchers have defined self-enhancement as the protection of the self from negative information by preserving subjectively positive beliefs and emotions *irrespective of their objective nature*, the discrepancy between the self-ratings and external criteria is not required for the

measurement of self-enhancement. Instead, external criteria are often utilised as anchors and it is the degree of the rating (i.e., optimistic/positive versus pessimistic/negative) that appears to be the important determinant.

Irrespective of these difficulties, numerous studies have indicated that the tendency to view and maintain a positive appraisal of oneself and one's situation can be used to explain a wide variety of behaviours including, a tendency to perceive oneself as better than others (e.g., Dunning, Meyerowitz, & Holzberg, 1989) and selective memory for positive rather than negative events (Sedikides et al., 2003). What's more, the tendency to self-enhance has been found to be influential, specifically with regard to the emotional and psychological functioning of an individual (e.g., Kitayama, Markus, & Kurokawa, 2000; Snibbe, Kitayama, Markus, & Suzuki, 2003).

For example, research by Kurman and Eshel (1998) examined the relationship between self-enhancement and emotional adjustment in a sample of Israeli high school students. Self-enhancement was determined by comparing self-evaluations of academic and social ability with two external criteria (i.e., school grades and social interactions), whereby higher self-evaluations in comparison to the external criteria were reflective of self-enhancement. Emotional adjustment was determined by high positive affectivity scores on three different emotional adjustment measures. Results from the study found that the majority of participants' self-ratings were higher than the external criteria, indicating that overall the sample had a tendency to self-enhance. A positive association between self-enhancement and emotional adjustment was also found, indicating that individuals who expressed self-enhancement were better adjusted emotionally. Theoretically, such results make sense as individuals who self-enhance are protecting their self-concepts from negative information by preserving only that information which is positive. As previously mentioned, such a tendency is especially important as it assists individuals to maintain positive views of themselves, which in turn become self-serving as positive views act to buffer against external negative information that may result in emotional maladjustment.

Similarly, the relationship between self-enhancement and psychological well-being was examined utilising samples of Singaporean Chinese and urban Israeli high school students; Israeli and Singaporean college students; Japanese and Israeli university students; and students who were either Israeli-born or Israeli of Ethiopian origin (e.g., Kurman, 2003). Self-enhancement was measured using two direct assessment approaches and one self-enhancement mechanism. The first of the direct assessment approaches compared participant's academic self-evaluations with academic grades, whereby higher self-evaluations in comparison to the actual grades, reflected higher levels of self-enhancement. The second direct assessment approach used, termed the above-average effect, asked participants to rate whether they considered themselves above or below average in comparison to their peers on six traits, with a predominance of above-average ratings being reflective of higher self-enhancement. The self-enhancement mechanism asked participants to rate the relevance of a number of success or failure situations to their self-esteem. Presumably, success situations are more likely to be perceived as positive, whilst failure situations are more likely to be perceived as negative. Therefore, individuals who self-enhance should be more likely to rate success situations, rather than failure situations, as relevant to their self-esteem. In the study, level of self-enhancement was determined by comparing the average rating of failure situations and the average rating of success situations, with greater ratings of success situations being indicative of self-enhancement. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965), Positive and Negative Affectivity scale (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), and the Emotional Self-Criticism scale (Blatt, D'affliti, & Quinlan, 1979) were used as measures of psychological well-being. Self-enhancement was positively and significantly related to psychological well-being (Kurman, 2003), with a positive and significant relationship also being found between self-enhancement and self-esteem. Again, such results make sense as self-enhancing individuals protect their self-concepts from negative information and preserve only that information which is positive. Therefore, such individuals should be less likely to emotionally self-criticise or demonstrate negative affect, and should be more likely to possess a high level of self-esteem and psychological well-being.

Similarly, previous research has found that people with high levels of self-esteem generally regard themselves, their family and their friends as possessing more positive attributes in comparison to others. Based on such findings, Kobayashi and Brown (2003) hypothesised that self-esteem would predict a tendency to self-enhance. A 32-item questionnaire was used to rate how important Japanese and American participants, who possessed either high or low self-esteem, thought it was for any person, themselves, their best friend, and most students at their university to possess each of eight attributes (i.e., competent; friendly; modest; persistent; responsible; well-liked; value friendship; and enjoy life with regard to recreation, work, and family). Based on previous findings (e.g., Brown & Kobayashi, 2002), a tendency to self-enhance was determined by individuals rating themselves and their best friends more favourably on each of the traits. The hypotheses stated that individuals who possessed high self-esteem would also be more likely to demonstrate self-enhancement, as the preservation of positive attributes characterises both self-esteem and self-enhancement. The results did indeed indicate that in both America and Japan, individuals who were high in self-esteem were also more likely to demonstrate self-enhancement, indicating that the preservation of positive information is a necessary factor for feeling good about oneself. However, it is difficult to ascertain from the results whether self-esteem promotes self-enhancement or whether self-enhancement promotes self-esteem. Irrespective of this, results such as these reveal the psychological benefits of maintaining a positive view of the self. Given that emotional adjustment and psychological well-being are considered to be imperative for the effective functioning of individuals and that research has found these variables to be positively related to self-enhancement, then self-enhancement must be a universal phenomenon influencing healthy psychological functioning.

However, cross-cultural differences in the tendency to self-enhance have been increasingly reported in the literature. For example, in recent research American participants indicated that self-esteem was more likely to increase in situations perceived as successful, than it was to decrease in situations perceived as failures. Conversely, Japanese participants indicated that self-esteem was more likely to decrease in failure situations than it would increase in situations

perceived as successful. Whilst the two sample populations may be perceived as essentially expressing the same views, the emphasis given to the situation most likely to affect the degree of expression of self-esteem is the point of interest. That is, Americans tended to emphasize the likelihood of self-esteem increasing due to success situations, as opposed to the Japanese who placed more emphasis on the likelihood of self-esteem decreasing in failure situations. Such findings suggest that for the American population, success situations are given emphasis and are more conducive to the maintenance of positive self-concepts, and therefore may be more conducive to self-enhancement. Whilst for Japanese populations, failure situations are emphasised and are therefore less conducive to the maintenance of positive self-concepts, and as a consequence, less conducive to self-enhancement. American participants were more likely to exhibit a strong tendency to self-enhance, whilst Japanese participants were less likely to show such a tendency (Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997). Such conclusions are feasible when the concepts of individualism and collectivism are considered. That is, being an individualist culture Americans should be more receptive to opportunities that enhance an individual's success and achievement of personal goals, as individual well-being and value is determined by the ability to conquer such personal feats. Therefore, placing more emphasis on expressing positive information regarding the self (success situations) rather than negative information (failure situations), serves a purpose for Americans with regard to making them feel good. Alternatively, Japanese are collectivists, placing importance on in-group cohesion and harmony, with expressed emphasis on one's self and one's successes being perceived as contradictory to these values. Therefore, increased emphasis on failure situations inhibits emphasis on success situations, thereby serving a purpose for individuals within this collectivist culture by allowing closer adherence to cultural norms.

In their study examining the relationships between self-esteem and self-enhancement, Kobayashi and Brown (2003) examined how important American and Japanese participants with either high or low levels of self-esteem, thought it was for any person, themselves, their best friend, and most students at their university to possess each of eight attributes. A tendency to self-enhance was

determined by individuals rating themselves and their best friends more favourably on each of the traits. Overall, results showed that both American and Japanese participants exhibited self-enhancement, with Japanese participants low in self-esteem showing the weakest tendency to self-enhance, whilst American participants high in self-esteem showed the strongest tendency to self-enhance. Based on these findings, the researchers concluded that self-enhancement was prevalent for participants from both cultures. However, the study results also showed that irrespective of self-esteem level or self-enhancement tendency, Japanese participants were more likely to rate their best friends more positively than themselves on the traits, whilst American participants were more likely to rate themselves more positively than their best friends. Whilst these results still support the overall conclusions of the researchers, they also make theoretical sense with respect to the dimensions of individualism and collectivism. Given that Japanese are collectivists, best friends are highly likely to be considered as significant others. In collectivist cultures, the self is defined only in terms of its' relationships with and connectedness to, significant others (Harrington & Liu, 2002). Therefore, expressing and enhancing the qualities of a significant other may be perceived as promoting the collective, and indirectly enhances the collective individual. Alternatively, American participants are individualists, and whilst best friends may be important, the self is viewed as bounded, distinct and separate from other selves, and defined in terms of its' unique personal attributes, traits, and characteristics (Harrington & Liu, 2002; Markus & Kitayama, 1994). Therefore, expressing and enhancing the qualities of the self takes on greater importance for individualists than it does for collectivists.

Findings such as those previously described, have led some to suggest that in collectivist cultures, such as many East Asian countries, self-enhancement exists (Heine, Kitayama, & Lehman, 2001; Heine et al., 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Snibbe et al., 2003), but is expressed at lower levels in comparison to individualist cultures, such as America and many Western European countries (Kurman et al., 2003; Kurman, 2003). Given the significant and positive relationships that self-enhancement has been found to share with emotional adjustment, psychological well-being and other behaviours (e.g., selective

memory, cognitive dissonance), self-enhancement must be essential to the beneficial functioning of individuals and must exist in all cultures, but it is the individualist or collectivist orientations of the culture that determine the *degree or level of expression* of self-enhancement. Specifically, self-enhancement should be actively expressed in individualist cultures, as the self is viewed and defined in terms of its unique characteristics and independence. Therefore, the maintenance and expression of positive information regarding oneself, would serve a purpose. Alternatively, relationships and connectedness to others define the self in collectivist societies. Consequently, self-enhancement would still be experienced internally as it serves a purpose for the individual in terms of the internal processes affecting behaviour (e.g., emotional functioning, psychological functioning, selective memory), however, the expression of self-enhancement should be restricted as it serves no obvious external objective for the individual. If this is so, then the restrictive behaviour must be controlled and moderated by some factor, which may best be explained by the concept of modesty, discussed in the following section.

### **1.3.1 Relationship with Modesty**

Modesty may be defined as “the public under-representation of one’s favourable traits and abilities” (Cialdini et al., 1998, p. 473), thus reflecting societal pressures to disregard one’s own success (Kurman, 2003). Ignoring one’s own achievements and successes facilitates the process of attending to and prioritising the achievements, successes, and specific demands of others. A defining characteristic of individuals within collectivist cultures is that behaviours are determined by a consideration of others reactions, needs, and desires, in an attempt to maintain harmonious relations. Under-representing one’s traits and abilities or behaving modestly serves a specific function for individuals operating within collectivist cultures.

Variations in modesty levels have been found to parallel levels of self-enhancement (Kurman, 2003). Specifically, modesty levels tend to be low when self-enhancement levels are high, and conversely high when the level of self-enhancement is low. A possible reason for such findings is that modesty may be synonymous with low levels of self-enhancement. From a research perspective,

low levels of self-enhancement are empirically determined by a decreased tendency to rate oneself positively on a number of traits (e.g., intelligence) or abilities (e.g., academic), and modesty is the public under-representation of one's favourable traits and abilities, so such a suggestion seems plausible. However, measures assessing self-enhancement may actually be tapping into the tendency to *express* self-enhancement rather than the actual *possession* of self-enhancement. That is, self-enhancement is essential to beneficial functioning (e.g., psychological well-being, emotional adjustment), so it must be possessed to some extent by all individuals. It may be then, that the measures utilised in the assessment of the construct may only be capturing an aspect of self-enhancement – expression. From this perspective, patterns showing parallels between the low expression of self-enhancement and a tendency to be modest would be evident. However, given that self-enhancement is an internal process unconsciously governed by selfways inherent to individuals, whilst modesty is the deliberate manifestation of a specific behaviour, the psychological processes underlying each of the concepts must be different. Consequently, whilst low self-enhancement and modesty may appear to be empirically parallel, psychologically they can be differentiated and therefore cannot be synonymous.

An initial study by Kurman (2001) attempted to explore how self-enhancement and modesty empirically interact, by examining the relationship between the two constructs, in a sample of Singaporean Chinese (collectivists), Israeli Druze (collectivists), and Israeli Jews (individualists). Utilising the self-enhancement measures previously described (e.g., Kurman, 2003) and the Modesty Responding Scale (MRS: Whetstone, Okun, & Cialdini, 1992), results showed that all cultural groups revealed a tendency to self-enhance, however, Singaporean Chinese participants exhibited lower levels of self-enhancement and higher levels of modesty in comparison to Israeli Druze and Israeli Jews. Additionally, despite being a collectivist culture, Israeli Druze modesty levels did not differ from those of the individualist Israeli Jews. A possible reason for these findings is that while the selfways of both the Singaporean Chinese and Israeli Druze cultures may be predominantly collectivist, there may be specific differences in some of these selfways which influence a tendency to be modest. That is, the selfways of the Singaporean Chinese may include cultural mandates

restricting the expression of one's favourable abilities and traits, whilst the selfways of the Israeli Druze may include cultural mandates that allow the expression of such abilities and traits. Such a suggestion seems plausible given that individualist and collectivist cultures are also comprised of horizontal and vertical dimensions (that are the consequence of specific selfways), which may in turn have varied impacts on the expression of modesty. However, without knowledge of the particular selfways specific to these cultures, it is difficult to ascertain from the research results whether this is indeed the reason for the differences in modesty levels between the cultures. Consequently, whilst modesty was salient in predicting levels of self-enhancement, Kurman suggested on the basis of the discrepancies in the modesty levels expressed by the Singaporean Chinese and Israeli Druze samples (collectivists), that modesty may be a behaviour specific to some collectivist cultures, rather than to all collectivist cultures.

In examining further the issue of modesty, self-enhancement and their relevance to collectivist cultures, a more recent study by Kurman (2003) investigated whether the low self-enhancement characteristic of collectivist cultures resulted from cultural restrictions specific to these cultures, which manifest as a tendency to be modest. Again utilising the MRS (Whetstone et al., 1992), comparisons were made between two collectivist samples (Singaporeans and Israeli's of Ethiopian origin) and two individualist samples (Israeli eleventh graders and Israeli students). Results showed that both collectivist samples had higher levels of modesty, than the individualist samples. Modesty was also found to be significantly related to verticality. In particular, vertical individualism was negatively correlated with modesty whilst vertical collectivism was positively correlated to modesty. Such results supported the contention expressed by the researcher, that modesty is intrinsic to vertical collectivism and inhibited by vertical individualism. Theoretically such results make sense as vertical collectivism is characterised by emphasis and significance being placed on in-group integrity and the forsaking of individual goals for those of the in-group. Therefore, vertical collectivists may have to under-represent their own favourable traits and abilities in order to facilitate the process of attending to and prioritising the achievements, successes, and specific demands of in-group

members. Consequently, modesty serves a specific function for individuals from vertical collectivist cultures, and may be inherent to this type of collectivist culture and not to horizontal collectivist cultures, or individualist cultures.

With respect to the present research, if a modesty bias is to be found in the study sample, then based on findings such as Kurman's (2003), Māori must be a vertical collectivist culture. This assumption may indeed be correct as being modest or *whakaiti* is actively encouraged and manifested within Māori culture. Specifically, expressed satisfaction or pride in one's own achievements is considered *whakahīhī*, egotistical, and even immature within Māori culture, and credit for personal achievements is often given (at least verbally by the individual concerned) to the achievers wider group (i.e., *whānau*, *iwi*, *hapū*) (P. Hirini, personal communication, July 1, 2004). Therefore, if Māori are indeed vertical collectivists, and self-enhancement (at least as a quantifiable behaviour) is found to exist but at low levels within the culture, a modesty bias may serve as an explanation for such findings.

#### **1.4 Overview of the Present Research**

Using previous studies that have examined the dimensions of individualism and collectivism and their relationships to self-enhancement and modesty, the present research sought to consider the following research goals:

**Firstly, to ascertain the prevalence of individualism and collectivism in a sample of New Zealand Māori.** Individualism and collectivism have been conceptualised as extreme dimensions on a continuum (Triandis & Suh, 2002), and constitute two distinct cultural patterns (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Given that research has found evidence of these cultural patterns in a variety of cultural groups (i.e., American, Israeli, Danish, Japanese, Singaporean, Chinese, Australian, Spanish), individualism and collectivism must be prevalent within the New Zealand Māori population also. The majority of studies examining the constructs of individualism and collectivism have been conducted utilising American or Western European and East Asian (predominantly Japanese, Hong

Kong, Korean, and Peoples Republic of China) samples. Some research has been conducted on other sample populations however, determining the specific implications of differences in individualism and collectivism for these nations is limited by the insufficient quantity of studies available to make reliable comparisons. Consequently, the intent of this first research goal is to provide information regarding the levels of individualism and collectivism in a Māori population sample, and compare such findings to those of previously studied population samples.

**Secondly, to assess whether cultural identity is associated with individualism and collectivism in a sample of New Zealand Māori.**

Determined by the dominant selfways within certain societies, the dimensions of individualism and collectivism have been found across a variety of cultural groups in many different countries. Consequently, the dimensions of individualism and collectivism will also be present within New Zealand society. An examination of the selfways that are specific to and predominant within the Māori population of New Zealand reveals that such selfways are characteristic of those possessed by individuals comprising collectivist cultures, particularly vertical collectivist cultures. However, given the diversity in cultural identification of contemporary Māori, the degree to which an individual affiliates to the Māori culture (or level of expressed cultural identity) should be associated with the degree to which individualism or collectivism (both horizontal and vertical) is expressed by individuals within the culture. That is, individuals who express a high level of affinity to Māori culture should express collectivist attributes, particularly vertical collectivist attributes; individuals who express low affiliation to Māori culture should possess fewer collectivist attributes; whilst individuals who express no affinity to Māori culture should be more likely to possess individualist attributes.

**Thirdly, to assess whether individualism and collectivism are associated with levels of self-enhancement, and whether levels of self-enhancement are associated with psychological well-being and academic intentions.** Specifically, self-enhancement should be actively expressed in individualist cultures, as the self is viewed and defined in terms of its unique characteristics

and independence. Therefore, the maintenance and expression of positive information regarding oneself, would serve a purpose. Alternatively, relationships and connectedness to others define the self in collectivist societies, restricting the expression of self-enhancement, as it serves no obvious social objective for the individual. Therefore, those individuals with a high level of Māori cultural identity who score high on vertical collectivism or horizontal collectivism will be less likely to express self-enhancement, whilst those individuals with a low level of Māori cultural identity who score high on vertical individualism or horizontal individualism will be less likely to express self-enhancement. Self-enhancement has been found to share significant and positive relationships with a number of variables important to the beneficial functioning of the individual, including emotional adjustment, psychological well-being, selective memory, and cognitive dissonance. With regard to the present research, psychological well-being and educational intentions are of particular interest. Specifically, as individuals who self-enhance protect their self-concepts from negative information and preserve only that information which is positive, these individuals will be more likely to possess a high level of psychological well-being, and will also be more likely to intend to continue studying.

**Fourthly, to assess whether levels of self-enhancement will be associated with a tendency to be modest.**

A defining characteristic of individuals within collectivist cultures is that behaviours are determined by a consideration of others reactions, needs, and desires, in an attempt to maintain harmonious relations with the in-group. Ignoring one's own achievements and successes through the expression of modest behaviour may facilitate the process of attending to and prioritising the achievements, successes, and specific demands of others. Intuitively then, modest behaviour serves a specific function for individuals operating within collectivist cultures, especially in Māori culture, whereby modesty or *whakaiti* is actively encouraged and manifested, whilst expressed satisfaction or pride in one's own achievements is considered *whakahīhī*, egotistical, and even immature. Therefore, those individuals with a high level of Māori cultural identity (collectivists) will be less likely to self-enhance and more likely to show a modesty bias, whilst individuals with a low level of expressed Māori cultural

identity (presumably individualists) should be more likely to self-enhance and less likely to show a modesty bias.

Given that significant relationships have been noted between the dimensions of individualism/collectivism and self-enhancement; self-enhancement and modesty; and, self-enhancement and a variety of behaviours important to the beneficial functioning of individuals, these same relationships should be more or less evident to varying degrees in the present research, depending on the level of individualism or collectivism expressed by individuals. Given this, the identification of individualism/collectivism in this sample of New Zealand Māori will be useful for estimating the prevalence of the dimensions in the general Māori population, which consequently will be useful for a number of specific reasons:

- providing some useful insights into the underlying processes, structures, beliefs, and norms that govern the functioning of Māori as an ethnic and cultural unit
- determining the level of self-enhancement characteristic of individuals with varying degrees of cultural identity, and estimating the effects this may have on psychological well-being, educational intentions, and a range of other functions and behaviours for such individuals
- ascertaining whether modesty explains low levels of expression of self-enhancement, thereby supporting the findings of previous research
- determining if a modesty tendency exists for individuals with varying degrees of cultural identity, which could be useful for explaining the underlying processes that determine certain behaviours in specific settings.

## CHAPTER 2 - METHOD

### 2.1 Participants

A non-probability convenience sample collected through the acquaintanceship networks of the author comprised the pool of participants. A total of 71 participants who were of Māori descent took part in the research, representing a response rate of 56%. The participants were either students who had studied within the past year or current students of tertiary education institutions.

### 2.2 Procedure

Participants were recruited via several acquaintanceship networks of the author. The first of the networks involved accessing students who were bursars of the Te Rau Puawai programme at Massey University. Te Rau Puawai is a joint initiative that was established by Massey University and the Ministry of Health, to support Māori students to gain or extend qualifications in the area of mental health (Mental Health Commission, 2003; Te Rau Puawai, 2004). Therefore, participants recruited via this method were all Māori students studying toward a variety of mental health qualifications. The author contacted the co-ordinator of the programme and sort permission to access a mailing list of students involved in the programme. Permission was granted by the co-ordinator and a mailing list of 110 students was obtained. The second method involved distributing questionnaires via a snowballing method to family, friends, and colleagues eligible to participate in the research.

Questionnaires (see Appendix B) were distributed via a standard mail out process. Attached to each questionnaire was a cover sheet describing who was conducting the research and that the research was being completed to fulfil the requirements of a Master of Arts degree at Massey University. The purpose of the research was outlined, which was to examine Māori cultural identity, and its relationship to individualism/collectivism, and academic self-enhancement, with the primary goal of the research being to examine how these factors may impact

on Māori. Participants were informed of who was eligible to complete the questionnaire, and that it would involve 10 minutes of their time. Attention was given to the fact that the participants had the right to refuse to answer any of the questions, with an assurance being provided that the information/data supplied would be completely anonymous and confidential to the researcher, and that additional information relating to the research could be obtained by contacting the researcher using the details provided on the cover sheet (see Appendix A). An option of receiving a group summary of the results was also provided via a feedback request form at the end of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Each questionnaire was distributed with a freepost envelope to encourage a rapid response.

## **2.3 Measures**

### **2.3.1 Dimensions of Culture**

*Individualism/Collectivism.* The 32-item I/C scale (Singelis et al., 1995) was used to assess participants' individualist/collectivist orientations as well as vertical/horizontal (hierarchical/equality) orientations. The dimensions of individualism and collectivism were assessed using 16-items each, with two items being additional. Of the 16, eight items assessed horizontal and vertical facets for each dimension. For example, "I am a unique individual", "I prefer to be direct and forthright with people", and "One should live one's life independently of others" - assessed horizontal individualism; "Winning is everything", "It annoys me when other people perform better than I do", and "Competition is the law of nature" - assessed vertical individualism; "I feel good when I cooperate with others", "My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me", and "To me, pleasure is spending time with others" - assessed horizontal collectivism; and, "Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure", "We should keep our aging parents with us at home", and "I hate to disagree with others in my group" - assessed vertical collectivism. A 7-point, Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) was used to indicate participants level of agreement with each statement. Item 30 was reversed scored prior to totals being calculated for

each subscale, with higher scores on a specific subscale (i.e., individualism (vertical or horizontal)/collectivism (vertical or horizontal) being indicative of participants' cultural orientation. The measure has been used extensively throughout cross-cultural research with internal consistencies for the subscales being reported as ranging between 0.46 to 0.84 for horizontal individualism; 0.60 to 0.76 for vertical individualism; 0.53 to 0.85 for horizontal collectivism; and 0.44 to 0.80 for vertical collectivism.

### **2.3.2 Cultural Identity**

*Māori Cultural Identity.* An extended version of the Te Hoe Nuku Roa (1999) Cultural Indicators measure, developed by Murray and Flett (2003) was used to assess level of identity with the Māori culture. The measure consisted of 13-items which reflected knowledge of ancestry, customs, and language (e.g., “How many generations of your Māori ancestry can you name?”); involvement with whānau, marae, and social contacts (e.g., “Which statement best describes the types of people you have the most contact with in general?”); and, self-identification (e.g., “If you had to choose one of these options that best describes you [a kiwi, a New Zealander, Māori/Pakeha, part Māori, a Polynesian, a Māori], which would it be?”). Responses were made on continuums of high to low levels of knowledge and exposure to those aspects of Māori culture. Responses to the measure items were recoded so that answers to each of the items were equal to either 0 or 1, prior to total scores for the measure being calculated. Due to limited response, responses across four items were removed prior to calculation of total scores. Higher overall scores were assumed to be reflective of higher levels of knowledge and exposure to aspects of Māori culture, and subsequently were assumed to be reflective of an increased sense of Māori cultural identity. Scoring details for the measure are provided in Appendix C.

### **2.3.3 Self-Enhancement**

*Academic Self-Enhancement.* Two questions adopted by Kurman (2003) and, Kurman and Sriram (2002) were utilised. The first asked participants “How successful were you in your [relevant studies] compared to your fellow students?” A 7-point, Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = *not successful at all* to

7 = *very successful*) was used to assess participants level of agreement with the question. The second question asked participants to estimate whether they are generally good students. Responses were made on a 7-point, Likert-type scale (1 = *I'm a very poor student*, to 7 = *I'm a very good student*). These responses were summed to produce a total overall score, with higher scores for both questions being indicative of academic self-enhancement.

*Above-average effect.* The method adopted by Kurman (2001; 2003) was utilised. Participants indicated whether they considered themselves to be above or below average on six traits (intelligence, health, sociability, cooperation, honesty, and generosity), with respect to a population of the same age and gender. Two options were available for responding (0 = *above-average* and 1 = *below average*). Responses were then totalled to produce an overall score, with lower overall scores (i.e., 0 to 3) being indicative of an above-average effect. Brown (1998) suggested that more than the expected 50% of many samples rate themselves as above-average with some studies indicating that between 74% to 94% of samples rate themselves as above-average across all traits.

*Educational Intentions.* This exploratory 3-item measure was used to assess the educational intentions of participants. Items focussed on current and future intentions with regard to continual study and included: "How frequently do you think about leaving your tertiary institution?", "How likely is it that you will search for another tertiary institution to attend?", "How likely is it that you will actually leave your tertiary institution within the next year?". A 4-point, Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 4 (*definitely*) was used to rate the likelihood of the indicated intentions. Lower overall scores were indicative of an intention to continue studying.

#### **2.3.4 Modesty**

*Modesty Responding Scale.* The 21-item MRS (Whetstone et al., 1992) was used to assess participant's inclination toward modesty (e.g., "I dislike speaking about myself in positive terms in the presence of others", "Telling people about my strengths and weaknesses has always been an embarrassing thing for me"), perceived social desirability of responses (e.g., "It is a real social mistake to

show off in public”, “Bragging on oneself in a group is always socially inappropriate”), and reverse scored items reflecting the propensity to brag (e.g., “If I’ve done something well I like to tell people about it”). Responses were made on a 7-point, Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). These responses were summed to produce a total response score, and divided by the total number of items (i.e., 21) to produce a final total overall score. Lower scores on the measure were indicative of a tendency to be modest. Internal consistencies for each of the subscales have been reported as ranging between 0.80 to 0.90 for the inclination toward modesty, as between 0.67 to 0.81 for the perceived social desirability of modesty, and as between 0.70 to 0.77 for the propensity to brag. Internal consistencies for the scale overall have been reported as ranging between 0.76 to 0.84.

### **2.3.5 Well-Being**

*Affectometer 2*. An 8-item sub-scale from the *Affectometer 2* (Kammann & Flett, 1983) measure was used to assess well-being. Participants were asked to indicate how often each of eight adjectives (e.g., hopeless, depressed, insignificant, confused, useful, clear-headed, optimistic, enthusiastic) was typical of the way they felt. Responses were made on a 5-point, Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*all the time*). Negative affect items were reversed scored prior to responses being summed to produce an overall total score. Higher overall scores were indicative of a more positive general well-being. Data has indicated that the measure has a high level of internal homogeneity and an average convergence of 0.70 with other subjective well-being scales. Based on this data, Diener (1984) stated that the measure deserves to be widely utilised for the assessment of affect.

### **2.3.6 Demographics**

Participants were asked to provide demographic information pertaining to age, gender, whakapapa (genealogy), and level of education.

## CHAPTER 3 – RESULTS

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was the computer programme utilised to analyse the data.

### 3.1 Descriptive Statistics

#### 3.1.1 Demographics

A total of 71 participants who were of Māori descent took part in the research, representing a response rate of 56%. Just over three quarters (78%) of the participants were female. Nearly half (45%) of all participants were over the age of 40, at the time of completing the questionnaire. Of those participants that were studying, nearly half (41%) were studying toward completion of an undergraduate degree, whilst a further quarter (25%) were studying to complete a postgraduate degree. Just over a quarter (27%) of all participants indicated that their highest educational qualification was an undergraduate degree, whilst equal proportions of participants indicated that their highest educational qualification was an undergraduate certificate (17%) or a secondary school qualification (17%).

A total of 47 iwi were represented by the research sample, with the majority of participants being affiliated to Ngāti Porou (20%), Ngā Puhī (14%), Ngāti Kahungunu (11%), Ngāti Raukawa (10%), and Ngāti Maniapoto (10%). Just under a quarter of all participants were affiliated to either Rongomaiwahine, (8%), Whakatōhea (7%), or Te Atiawa (7%), whilst a total of 39 iwi were represented by the remaining 13% of participants.

#### 3.1.2 Measures

Table 1 provides an overview of the means, standard deviations and alpha reliabilities across all additive scales. As shown in the table, the research participants scored highly on the horizontal dimensions of culture, as indicated specifically by the high overall mean score on the horizontal collectivism

subscale, and also a comparatively high mean score on the horizontal individualism subscale. Overall high mean scores on the academic self-enhancement measure and the modesty responding scale were also observed, indicating that the research sample were likely to self-enhance and less likely to be modest. High mean scores on the cultural identity measure, suggest that overall the research sample possessed increased levels of identity and affiliation to the Māori culture. The mean score for the above average effect was equivalent to the maximum score, indicating that across all of the traits, research participants considered themselves to be above average. Cronbach's alpha data indicates that each of the measures had acceptable reliability by standard psychometric criteria.

Table 1  
*Means, Standard Deviations, Alpha Reliabilites, and Score Range Data of Research Variables*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Scale (score range)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b><math>\alpha</math></b>
Dimensions of Culture	HC subscale (min=1, max=7)	5.38	0.76	0.83
	HI subscale (min=1, max=7)	3.91	0.71	0.76
	VC subscale (min=1, max=7)	3.38	0.66	0.68
	VI subscale (min=1, max=7)	2.45	0.55	0.62
Self-Enhancement	Academic Self-Enhancement (min=2, max=14)	10.20	2.00	0.72
Modesty	Modesty Responding scale (min=1, max=7)	4.60	1.00	0.93
Psychological Well-Being	Affectometer 2 (min=1, max=5)	1.90	1.30	0.84
Cultural Identity	Cultural Identity measure (min=0, max=9)	5.62	2.63	N/A

### **3.1.3 Individualism/Collectivism Variables**

The preliminary objectives regarding the prevalence of individualism and collectivism in a sample of New Zealand Māori were tested. As is evident from Table 2, the collectivist samples scored higher on the horizontal subscales than the vertical subscales, with overall mean scores on horizontal collectivism being

similar across populations. Overall mean scores on the remaining subscales were similar across all samples, with the exception of the Māori sample, whereby mean scores were markedly lower by comparison. Interestingly, the two immigrant sample populations (e.g., African American, Asian American) scored higher on the horizontal individualism subscale than the horizontal collectivism subscale, despite these populations often being perceived as collectivists.

Table 2  
*Means (and Standard Deviations) of Various Collectivist Samples on the Individualism and Collectivism Subscales*

Sample	HC	HI	VC	VI
Māori, n = 71 (present research)	5.38 (0.76)	3.91 (0.71)	3.38 (0.66)	2.45 (0.55)
Singaporean, n = 130 (Kurman & Sriram, 2002)	5.32 (0.84)	5.30 (1.15)	5.80 (1.01)	4.19 (1.00)
African American, n = 23 (Coon & Kimmelmeier, 2001)	5.42 (0.59)	6.20 (0.80)	4.22 (0.61)	3.82 (1.26)
Asian American, n = 18 (Coon & Kimmelmeier, 2001)	5.38 (0.65)	5.75 (0.80)	4.70 (0.70)	4.20 (1.13)
Spanish, n = 526 (Gouveia et al., 2003)	5.48 (0.91)	5.23 (0.84)	4.60 (1.07)	3.21 (1.22)

A further objective was to compare the present sample other samples with regard to individualism and collectivism. One-way factorial analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to test for significant differences between the collectivist sample populations on each of the individualism/collectivism subscales (i.e., HC, HI, VC, VI). Separate ANOVAs showed highly significant effects for the horizontal individualism subscale,  $F(4, 763) = 46.70, p < 0.001$ ; the vertical collectivism subscale,  $F(4, 763) = 71.27, p < 0.001$ ; and, the vertical individualism subscale,  $F(4, 763) = 34.29, p < 0.001$ . Effects were non-significant for horizontal collectivism. A series of post-hoc tests (Tukey's HSD) were calculated for each significant dependent variable to determine where differences occurred. Results of the tests indicated that at both the  $p < 0.05$  level, significant differences occurred between the Māori sample and the other

samples, across the HI, VC and VI subscales. The Singaporean, Asian American, African American and Spanish samples did not differ significantly from each other. The findings indicate that Māori differ from other samples with regard to vertical collectivist and individualist characteristics.

Mean scores for the individualist samples are provided in Table 3. In particular, mean scores were highest for European American samples on both the horizontal dimensions, thereby showing a similar pattern to that of the present research sample. Alternatively, Urban Israeli's scored highest on the horizontal individualism subscale, and showed minimal variation in mean scores across the other subscales. The American sample's mean scores were markedly higher across all subscales in comparison to the other samples, with higher mean scores being evident for both the collectivist subscales, despite Americans often being perceived as individualists. Table 4 provides comparisons in mean scores across individualism/collectivism subscales, for three individualist samples and the present research sample.

Table 3  
*Means (and Standard Deviations) of Various Individualist Samples on the Individualism and Collectivism Subscales*

<b>Sample</b>	<b>HC</b>	<b>HI</b>	<b>VC</b>	<b>VI</b>
Māori, n = 71 (present research)	5.38 (0.76)	3.91 (0.71)	3.38 (0.66)	2.45 (0.55)
European Americans, n = 122 (Coon & Kemmelmeier, 2001)	5.39 (0.68)	5.70 (0.80)	4.27 (0.80)	4.27 (1.05)
Urban Israeli's, n = 144 (Kurman & Sriram, 2002)	4.87 (0.98)	5.58 (1.00)	4.86 (1.58)	4.92 (1.34)
Americans, n = 180 (Soh & Leong, 2002)	7.14 (1.15)	6.91 (1.25)	7.15 (1.20)	5.46 (1.64)

Separate ANOVAs for each of the subscales were conducted to test for significant differences between the individualist samples. Highly significant effects were found for each of the subscales. Specifically, the horizontal

collectivism subscale,  $F(3, 513) = 174.23, p < 0.001$ ; the horizontal individualism subscale,  $F(3, 513) = 154.56, p < 0.001$ ; the vertical collectivism subscale,  $F(3, 513) = 246.70, p < 0.001$ ; and, the vertical individualism subscale,  $F(3, 513) = 93.71, p < 0.001$ . Post-hoc comparisons (Tukey's HSD) were performed for each significant dependent variable, to assess where differences occurred. With horizontal collectivism as the dependent variable, significant differences were evident between the Māori sample and the Urban Israeli and American sample populations. Across the remaining dependent variables (HI, VC, VI) Māori differed significantly from the other sample populations, who did not differ significantly from each other.

Taken together, ANOVA results indicate that the present Māori sample has a horizontal collectivist orientation, and across the other dimensions of culture, the sample is different to other samples that have been studied. Such findings are informative and may serve as a useful source for providing comparisons across individualism/collectivism research.

A further objective of the present research was to assess associations between individualism/collectivism, cultural identity and self-enhancement. In order to identify those associations, a series of standard multiple regression were performed between the dependent variables of horizontal collectivism (HC), horizontal individualism (HI), vertical collectivism (VC) and vertical individualism (VI); and age, self-enhancement, modesty and cultural identity as the independent variables. The variables were tested for the assumptions of statistical analysis, prior to regression analysis being performed. Conventional yet conservative alpha levels (e.g.,  $p < 0.001$ ) were utilised to evaluate the significance of skewness and kurtosis (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1989). One case with high z scores on both horizontal dimensions was found to be a univariate outlier, so was subsequently excluded from the remaining analyses. Mahalanobis distance was utilised to confirm that other cases were not multivariate outliers with  $p < 0.001$ . The following tables present the results of the analyses, which display bivariate correlations between the variables, standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ),  $R$ ,  $R^2$ , and adjusted  $R^2$ .

The results of the first analysis with horizontal collectivism as the dependent variable are presented in Table 4.

Table 4  
*Standard Multiple Regression of Horizontal Collectivism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity, Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), R, R<sup>2</sup>, and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> (N=53)*

Variable	Horizontal Collectivism	Age in Years	Academic Self-Enhancement	Above Average Effect	Modesty	Beta
Age in Years	-.21					-.15
Academic Self-Enhancement	.34**	-.25*				.33*
Above Average Effect	-.53	-.16	.13			-.76
Modesty	.19	.05	.08	-.24*		.15
Cultural Identity	.07	.02	-.19	-.04	-.01	.13
R						.43
R <sup>2</sup>						.18
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>						.10

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

As shown in the table, the dependent variable shared a positive and significant relationship with academic self-enhancement, although the strength of the relationship was weak ( $r = 0.34$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Horizontal collectivism and the above-average effect were negatively and moderately associated. Although this relationship was non-significant, results suggest that an increased horizontal collectivist orientation will be associated with a decreased tendency for the above-average effect. Significant and negative relationships were found between age and academic self-enhancement ( $r = -0.25$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and modesty and the above-average effect ( $r = -0.24$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), however, the strength of both relationships was weak. Contrary to predictions, cultural identity was not

significantly associated with the dependent variable. The standardized regression coefficients suggest that only academic self-enhancement had a significant independent impact on horizontal collectivism. *R* for regression indicated that the results were not significantly different from zero.

Table 5 presents the results of the analysis with horizontal individualism as the dependent variable.

Table 5  
*Standard Multiple Regression of Horizontal Individualism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity, Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), R, R<sup>2</sup>, and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> (N=53)*

<b>Variable</b>	Horizontal Individualism	Age in Years	Academic Self-Enhancement	Above Average Effect	Modesty	Beta
Age in Years	-.09					.07
Academic Self-Enhancement	.34*	-.22				-.05
Above Average Effect	-.08	-.13	.13			-.06
Modesty	.05	-.01	.06	-.28*		.03
Cultural Identity	-.09	.04	-.13	-.03	-.04	-.10
R						.16
R <sup>2</sup>						.02
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>						-.08

\* $p < 0.05$

As shown in the table, a positive and significant, yet weak relationship was shared between the independent variable and academic self-enhancement ( $r = 0.34$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Modesty and the above-average effect shared a significant and negative relationship, although the strength of the relationship was weak ( $r = -0.28$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Cultural identity and the dependent variable shared a

negative and extremely weak relationship, which was non-significant. Results were not significantly different from zero, as indicated by *R* for regression.

The results of the analysis with vertical collectivism as the dependent variable are presented in Table 6.

Table 6  
*Standard Multiple Regression of Vertical Collectivism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity, Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), *R*, *R*<sup>2</sup>, and Adjusted *R*<sup>2</sup> (*N*=53)*

<b>Variable</b>	Vertical Collectivism	Age in Years	Academic Self-Enhancement	Above Average Effect	Modesty	Beta
Age in Years	-.18					-.16
Academic Self-Enhancement	.13	-.23				.11
Above Average Effect	-.12	-.09*	.15			-.07
Modesty	.30**	-.03	.05	-.25*		.28
Cultural Identity	.16	.04	-.12	-.05	-.03	.18
<i>R</i>						.40
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>						.16
Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>						.07

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

As shown in the table, a positive and highly significant relationship was shared between vertical collectivism and modesty ( $r = 0.30$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Modesty and the above-average effect shared a significant and negative relationship ( $r = -0.25$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), as did age and the above-average effect, although the strength of this relationship was extremely weak ( $r = -0.09$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Interestingly, the association between cultural identity and the dependent variable, though still non-significant, was positive and stronger for this analysis in comparison to the

previous analyses in which the horizontal dimensions comprised the dependent variables. Results were not significantly different from zero, as indicated by *R* for regression.

Table 7 shows the results of the analysis with vertical individualism as the dependent variable. Modesty and the above-average effect were the only variables to share a significant relationship, which was negative ( $r = -0.27$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The relationship between cultural identity and the dependent variable was again non-significant. Results were not significantly different from zero, as indicated by *R* for regression.

Table 7  
*Standard Multiple Regression of Vertical Individualism on Age, Self-Enhancement, Modesty and Cultural Identity Showing Correlations, Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ), R, R<sup>2</sup>, and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> (N=53)*

<b>Variable</b>	Vertical Individualism	Age in Years	Academic Self-Enhancement	Above Average Effect	Modesty	Beta
Age in Years	-.14					-.14
Academic Self-Enhancement	-.08	-.21				-.15
Above Average Effect	.21	-.13	.14			.22
Modesty	-.03	.02	.04	-.27*		.03
Cultural Identity	-.10	.06	-.14	-.02	-.07	-.11
R						.30
R <sup>2</sup>						.09
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>						-.01

\* $p < 0.05$

### 3.1.4 Self-Enhancement, Psychological Well-Being, and Academic Intentions

A further objective of the present research was to assess whether self-enhancement was associated with psychological well-being and academic intentions. Specifically, it was predicted that self-enhancement would share positive relationships with both psychological well-being and academic intentions. As shown in Table 8, Pearson’s correlational data indicated that self-enhancement was positively related to both positive affect and psychological well-being, and negatively related to negative affect. However, the strength of the relationships was weak and non-significant.

Table 8  
*Correlations Among Two Self-Enhancement Measures, Positive Affect, Negative Affect, and Overall Psychological Well-Being*

Variable	Academic Self-Enhancement	Above-Average Effect
Above-Average Effect	.17	
Positive Affect	.06	.15
Negative Affect	-.11	-.01
Psychological Well-Being	.09	.08

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

Table 9 presents the results of Pearson’s correlations among self-enhancement and academic intentions. The academic intention variables were numbered and represented each of the questions (1 = “how frequently do you think about leaving your tertiary institution”, 2 = “how likely is it that you will search for another tertiary institution to attend”, 3 = “how likely are you to leave your tertiary institution within the next year”). These questions were not totalled to produce an overall academic intentions score, as the purpose was to assess if self-enhancement impacted on each specific decision. As shown in the table, self-enhancement and academic intentions were not significantly related,

suggesting that levels of self-enhancement do not effect decisions regarding study at tertiary education institutions.

Table 9  
*Correlations Among Two Self-Enhancement Measures and Academic Intentions*

Variable	Academic Self-Enhancement	Above-Average Effect
Academic Intentions 1	-0.06	0.19
Academic Intentions 2	0.12	0.06
Academic Intentions 3	0.21	-0.05

### 3.1.5 Self-Enhancement and Modesty

A final objective of the present research was to assess whether self-enhancement is associated with modesty. The specific prediction was that self-enhancement and modesty would share a negative relationship. Table 10 displays the results of Pearson’s correlations among the self-enhancement measures and modesty. Self-enhancement, as measured by the above-average effect, shared a significant, negative relationship with modesty ( $r = -0.26, p < 0.05$ ). The result supports the research prediction and suggests that as levels of self-enhancement increase, modesty simultaneously decreases. Academic self-enhancement and modesty were not significantly associated.

Table 10  
*Correlations Among Two Self-Enhancement Measures and Modesty*

Variable	Academic Self-Enhancement	Above Average Effect
Above Average Effect	.17	
Modesty	.03	-.26*

\* $p < 0.05$

## CHAPTER 4 – DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Findings and Implications

The present research has a number of limitations that will be discussed in subsequent sections. However, a number of tentative speculations are still possible based on the findings.

#### 4.1.1 Individualism/Collectivism, Māori and Cultural Identity

With respect to the first research goal, the dimensions of individualism and collectivism are prevalent within the present research sample of New Zealand Māori, with findings indicating that the horizontal collectivism dimension predominates. Specifically, and in contrary to predictions that vertical collectivism scores would be high, data indicated the sample scored highest overall on the horizontal collectivism subscale, in comparison to scores on the other individualism/collectivism subscales. Such a finding is similar to that of Harrington and Liu (2002) who found Māori scored higher on collectivism when assessed using two separate individualism/collectivism measures.

Results of post-hoc tests also indicated that Māori differed significantly from other collectivist (e.g., Singaporean, African American, Asian American, Spanish) and individualist (e.g., European Americans, Urban Israeli's, Americans) samples across all subscales, except horizontal collectivism. Individualism and collectivism have been conceptualised as extreme dimensions on a continuum (Triandis & Suh, 2002), and constitute two distinct cultural patterns (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Therefore, collectivist samples should differ from individualist samples, so the significant differences indicated between the Māori sample and individualist samples make theoretical sense. What's more, the finding is consistent with other studies that have reported significant differences between samples (e.g., Kashima et al., 1995).

However, it is difficult to ascertain from the results, areas and reasons of difference between Māori and the other collectivist samples. However, a possible explanation for the differences relates to the issue of whether the same items or questions are assessing the underlying dimensions of individualism and collectivism when used cross-culturally, and more specifically when used with Māori samples. As previously alluded to, few studies to date have examined the cross-cultural equivalence of measurement items utilised in assessing the selfways that constitute individualist and collectivist patterns in different cultures, so certainty regarding this explanation is limited.

The Singelis et al. (1995) measure has provided consistent results regarding the existence of individualism and collectivism across a variety of sample populations (Gouveia et al., 2003; Kurman & Sriram, 2002; Thomas and Perkerti, 2003), and reliable correlations have been found between scores on the measure and other variables (e.g., self-enhancement), which suggests that the measure must be systematically tapping into some underlying psychological processes associated with individualism and collectivism (R. Flett, personal communication, September 10, 2004). Whilst the items comprising the Singelis et al. measure appear also to tap the selfways characteristic of horizontal collectivism in the Māori culture, the measurement items assessing horizontal individualism, vertical collectivism and vertical individualism may not do so in any systematic way, thus accounting for the low mean scores on these subscales for the present sample and the observed differences between the present and other samples.

The implications of these findings are twofold. Firstly, it is evident that more research is required with Māori samples before any assumptions can be drawn regarding the prevalence of individualism and collectivism in the Māori culture. Subsequently, any implications that the prevalence of the dimensions may have for Māori, such as the previously suggested relationships with some psychological variables (e.g., self-enhancement), must be interpreted with caution until a larger body of findings is available to make comparisons. Secondly, the measures that currently dominate individualism/collectivism

research may not be useful for assessing the dimensions across all cultural groups. In order for reliable comparisons between the dimensions to be made across cultures, measures that effectively tap into the inherent cultural selfways that are characteristic of individualism/collectivism for any specific culture, must be developed and cross-culturally standardised. Until such measures are developed and a larger body of research is available to provide sufficient comparisons between samples, caution should be exercised when assessing individualism and collectivism in samples that have not been previously researched.

A second research goal assessed the association between Māori cultural identity and the dimensions of individualism/collectivism. High mean scores were displayed on the cultural identity measure, suggesting the sample had an increased sense of identification with Māori culture. The results are promising with regard to the measurement strategy. Specifically, the measurement strategy had some face validity and was able to differentiate between individuals, as indicated by variability within the sample (R. Flett, personal communication, October 4, 2004).

Additionally, research findings indicated that cultural identity was negatively associated with individualism and positively associated with collectivism, in addition to sharing a stronger relationship with vertical facets of these dimensions, than with the horizontal facets, which again provides some evidence for the validity of the measurement strategy. However, the relationships were non-significant. Subsequently, the specific implication this finding has is with regards to the measurement of the Māori cultural identity construct. As previously mentioned, cultural identity is a subjective classification or affinity to the selfways of a specific group (Gouveia et al., 2002; Gurung & Mehta, 2001). Exactly what constitutes the cultural identity of any individual is largely determined through the endorsement of *certain* selfways specific to a group. Māori live in realities that are diverse (Durie, 2001), so the selfways endorsed by any given individual affiliating to the Māori culture will be unique and differ. Consequently, the cultural identities of

contemporary Māori are as varied as other New Zealanders (Bennett, 2001), and such diversification creates difficulties with determining the composition of measurement items that accurately capture the Māori cultural identity construct. In their measure, Murray and Flett (2003) provided a range of items perceived as indicative of a Māori cultural identity. Although four items were removed due to excessive non-response, high mean scores were evidenced in the present research, suggesting the measure must be tapping into some aspect of Māori cultural identity for the present sample, and therefore may serve to be utilised as a measure of Māori cultural identity in future research.

Despite the associations between variables being non-significant, a number of tentative interpretations are still possible. As predicted, cultural identity and collectivism were positively associated, suggesting that as the degree of Māori cultural identity increases, collectivism levels simultaneously increase. The previously described selfways predominant within Māori culture indicate that such selfways map very closely onto aspects that are generally characteristic of an interdependent self-construal, which are principally possessed by individuals comprising a collectivist culture. Cultural identity involves relatedness through social and symbolic ties and the sharing of prescribed cultural beliefs, values, norms, and interactions (Durie, 2001; Gurung & Mehta, 2001), so individuals with high levels of cultural identity will share the same selfways. Based on the association between the variables, the result supports the suggestion that the selfways characteristic of Māori culture, are indeed collectivistic in nature. Additionally, behaviours reflective of the selfways of whanaungatanga, kotahitanga, and utu are characteristic of those behaviours expressed by vertical collectivists (significance placed on in-group integrity, dutifulness, forsaking individual goals for that of the in-group, etc). This may explain the stronger association (albeit non-significant) cultural identity had with vertical facets as opposed to the horizontal facets.

The findings indicate an inverse relationship between Māori cultural identity and individualism. That is, individuals scoring low on the Māori cultural identity measure, will likely score high on measures of individualism, and vice versa.

Such a finding makes theoretical sense in a Māori context, as the selfways inherent to the culture do not resemble those characteristics typical of individualist cultures. However, it may well be that the selfways of other cultural groups are reflective of individualist characteristics. Therefore, individuals who have a high degree of identity with and affiliation to those specific cultures will presumably share such selfways. However, in order to determine the relative effect cultural identity has in determining the prevalence of individualism/collectivism in other cultural groups, the specific selfways of the group need to be examined and appropriate measures developed to capture the construct of identity for these cultures.

#### **4.1.2 Individualism/Collectivism and Self-Enhancement**

Assessing the association between individualism/collectivism and self-enhancement was a further objective of the present research. The mean score for academic self-enhancement was moderately high, whilst the mean score for the above-average effect was extremely high, both of which indicated the sample had an overall tendency to self-enhance. When utilised as the dependent variable in the regression analysis, horizontal collectivism shared a significant positive relationship with academic self-enhancement, and a significant negative relationship with the above-average effect. Academic self-enhancement was the only independent variable to have a significant, independent relationship with horizontal collectivism.

Academic self-enhancement and the above-average effect can be differentiated, as the former is presumably an individual's objective perception regarding their academic abilities in comparison to others, whilst the latter is a subjective assessment of one's traits. High scores on the above-average effect indicate that the sample self-enhanced on subjective, individually-specific traits. Alternatively, the mean score for academic self-enhancement ( $x = 10.20$ ) suggests that the average answers to both questions for this variable were: "somewhat successful" and "I'm somewhat of a successful student" (see Appendix B for questionnaire items). Such responses when compared to other potential responses in the questionnaire, whilst still self-enhancing, may be

indicative of a perception that the individual does not consider themselves to be distinctly better or worse than their peers when considering academic ability.

The distinction among the response items to these questions, and between the self-enhancement measures becomes important when considering the relationship between self-enhancement and horizontal collectivism. The horizontal dimension is typified by equality and similarity (Gushue & Constantine, 2003; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), and in horizontal collectivist cultures, an orientation toward interdependence, similarity, and equality exists among individuals. The findings show that horizontal collectivism is prevalent in the present research sample, indicating that similarity and equality exist among the sample participants, thus providing an explanation for the significantly positive relationship found between academic self-enhancement and horizontal collectivism, as well as the significant independent impact self-enhancement had on horizontal collectivism. Self-enhancing on subjective, individually-specific traits presumably is not conducive to the equality and similarity characteristic of horizontal individualism, and serves to explain why the above-average effect was negatively associated to this facet of collectivism in the present research sample.

Regression analyses with horizontal individualism as the dependent variable indicated a significant positive relationship with academic self-enhancement. Again, the horizontal dimension is typified by equality and similarity (Gushue & Constantine, 2003; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), and mean scores for academic self-enhancement indicate the sample did not consider themselves' to be distinctly better or worse than their peers when considering academic ability. As detailed above, such factors provide a possible explanation for the finding.

Neither of the self-enhancement measures shared significant relationships with the vertical facets of individualism and collectivism. Verticality is characterised by hierarchy and differentiation (Gushue & Constantine, 2003; Nelson & Shavitt, 2002; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Based on the above explanations,

responses on the academic self-enhancement measure were characteristic of equality and similarity (horizontal orientation), so the non-significant relationships between academic self-enhancement and verticality make theoretical sense. However, the second measure of self-enhancement, the above-average effect, required participants to rate themselves as above or below average on a number of traits (i.e., intelligence, health, sociability). The extent to which an individual rates them self is largely determined by an egoistic bias that differentiates the self from others (Kurman, 2001). Based on this, the above-average effect should have shared some association with vertical facets.

Significant negative associations were evident between age and academic self-enhancement when both horizontal collectivism and vertical collectivism served as the dependent variables in the regression analyses. This finding suggests that as age increases, the tendency to rate one's academic ability positively, decreases. The majority of participants were aged 40 years and over. Such participants are less likely to have been continuously immersed within educational institutions over a prolonged period, in comparison to participants of younger age groups (e.g., 18 to 24 years), and may be returning to study after many years. Based on this assumption, older participants may be less aware of their academic capabilities, so may be less likely to rate them as positively as younger participants, who may be more aware of their abilities as a result of continual immersion in educational environments (e.g. the progression from secondary school, to undergraduate study to post-graduate study).

#### **4.1.3 Self-Enhancement, Psychological Well-being and Academic Intentions**

Assessing the relationship between self-enhancement and psychological well-being was another research goal. Contrary to predictions and previous findings (e.g., Kitayama et al., 2000; Snibbe et al., 2003), results of the present research indicated that self-enhancement was not significantly related to psychological well-being.

A reason for this finding may relate to the measurement of self-enhancement. In particular, previous researchers (e.g., Assor et al., 1990; Kenny & Albright, 1987) have indicated some difficulties with finding valid external criteria to be utilised for assessing self-enhancement. Specifically, self-ratings of academic ability are often compared to an individual's actual academic grades, with the difficulty arising in the interpretation of the responses. That is, individual's who rate academic ability positively and a comparison of their academic grades indicates that the rating is true, is this rating indicative of a tendency to self-enhance or is the rating just a realistic assessment of the individual's ability? Alternatively, individual's who rate their academic ability positively but a comparison to academic grades indicates that the rating is an excessively positive assessment with no basis in reality, is this rating indicative of self-enhancement? Presumably, the two types of responses will result from the differing internal psychological processes of the individual (R. Flett, personal communication, September 10, 2004), and will be good determinants of an individuals psychological well-being.

In the present research, self-enhancement shared a number of significant relationships with some of the dimensions of culture, so systematically tapped into some aspects of the self-enhancement construct. However, no external criteria (e.g., academic grades, number of social interactions) were used to make comparisons to the responses of the sample. Therefore, determining the psychological processes underlying the responses and their associated effects on psychological well-being was severely limited. Whilst issues regarding measurement of the self-enhancement construct were thoroughly explored prior to choice of measures and compilation of the research questionnaire, such a methodological oversight may account for the non-significant relationships between the variables of self-enhancement and psychological well-being.

The distinction between self-enhancement and self-esteem may provide an alternative explanation for the findings. A positive and significant relationship has been found between self-enhancement and self-esteem (Kurman, 2003), and previous research indicated that people with high levels of self-esteem generally regard themselves, their family and their friends as possessing more positive

attributes in comparison to others (Kobayashi & Brown, 2003). Results of self-enhancement studies often show that most people rate themselves positively, and when the above-average effect is utilised as a measure of the construct, 74% to 94% of samples rate themselves as above-average across all traits (Brown, 1998). Based on these findings, the outcomes attributed to both self-enhancement and self-esteem appear to be similar, if not the same. Given that such outcomes are essentially the same, the underlying psychological processes determining the manifestation of these outcomes, must also be the same. Consequently, whilst self-enhancement and self-esteem have been conceptually differentiated, psychologically they may actually be synonymous. Again, issues regarding measurement of the self-enhancement construct were thoroughly explored prior to choice of measures and compilation of the research questionnaire. However, a self-esteem measure (e.g., Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale, 1965) could have been utilised in addition to the self-enhancement measures. Although this would not have resolved the issue of whether self-enhancement and self-esteem are synonymous, it would have provided an opportunity for increased clarity regarding how the constructs are associated with each other, and with each of the study variables.

What's more, the psychological well-being measure utilised in the present research has a high level of internal homogeneity and an average convergence of 0.70 with other subjective well-being scales, which led to the suggestion the measure should be widely used for the assessment of affect (Diener, 1984). Acceptable alpha levels ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ) for the measure were found for the present sample, indicating the measure had good reliability. These results suggest that the measure was effective for assessing psychological well-being in the present sample, and support the assumption that the described measurement difficulties associated with the self-enhancement construct may have contributed to the non-significant findings between the two variables. An alternative explanation inconsistent with previous findings of other sample populations (e.g., Kitayama et al, 2000; Snibbe et al., 2003), is that self-enhancement is not essential for beneficial psychological functioning of the Māori sample.

A further objective of the research was to assess the relationship between self-enhancement and academic intentions. Correlational data indicated that the variables were not significantly related, suggesting that levels of self-enhancement do not effect decisions regarding study at tertiary education institutions. An explanation for the findings is that rather than one's perception of their abilities being the point of concern, other factors (e.g., financial, familial, educational structure/options available at the institution) are more important when considering one's educational intentions, and such factors become more salient in the decision process determining whether an individual remains at or leaves an educational institution.

#### **4.1.4 Self-Enhancement and Modesty**

A final objective of the present research was to examine the relationship between self-enhancement and a tendency to be modest. The specific prediction was high levels of self-enhancement would be associated with low levels of modesty and vice versa. High mean scores on the modesty responding scale were suggestive that overall, the sample was less likely to exhibit modesty.

Across all the regression analyses utilising each of the individualism/collectivism subscales as the dependent variables (HC, HI, VC, VI), modesty and the above-average effect shared significant negative relationships. Similarly, using Pearson's correlational data, the relationship between modesty and the above-average effect was again significant and negative. The findings are consistent with those of Kurman (2001), and suggest that individuals that self-enhance on traits represented by the above-average effect are less likely to be modest.

However, these findings must be interpreted with caution. As previously mentioned, variations in modesty levels have been found to parallel levels of self-enhancement (Kurman, 2003), such that modesty levels are low when self-enhancement is high, and high when levels of self-enhancement are low. An explanation for this is that high levels of modesty are synonymous with low levels of self-enhancement. From a research perspective, low levels of self-

enhancement are empirically determined by a decreased tendency to rate oneself positively on a number of traits (e.g., intelligence) or abilities (e.g., academic), and modesty is the public under-representation of one's favourable traits and abilities, so such a suggestion seems plausible. In the context of the present study, the above-average effect required participants to rate themselves as above or below average on a number of traits (i.e., intelligence, health, sociability), with high mean scores for the effect indicating that overall ratings across the traits were above-average for the sample. High scores for the modesty responding scale indicated the sample did not have a tendency to under-represent their desirable traits and abilities. The high levels of self-enhancement appear to be exactly the same as low levels of modesty in the present sample. With this in mind, it may be that self-enhancement and modesty are synonymous constructs, which may explain the significant relationships found between the variables.

## **4.2 Limitations of the Present Research and Suggestions for Future Research**

There are a number of methodological issues associated with the present research that must be acknowledged for their potential biasing effect on the findings.

### **4.2.1 Procedural Limitations**

Firstly, the small sample size ( $N = 71$ ), and the disproportionate number of males to females raises issues about the extent to which findings may be generalised to the wider population, in addition to raising concerns regarding statistical power (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1989). Specifically, the limited number of participants may, in part, explain the non-significant effects across the majority of the regression analyses.

The participant recruitment method utilised was non-random in nature and derived largely from a specific population of Māori students. The majority of participants were recipients of a bursary to research at a tertiary institution,

whereby the rewarding criteria are based largely on ability to succeed academically, suggesting that the participants are more inclined to achieve educationally. Given this, the sample participants are more likely to academically self-enhance, as maintaining a positive regard about one's academic ability should presumably foster a motivation to succeed academically.

Additionally, Te Rau Puawai is a bursary scheme aimed at providing assistance to Māori students. Presumably, those individuals who have greater access to information concerning Māori specific awards and scholarships may be more likely to have applied for the Te Rau Puawai bursary. Given that access to Māori cultural resources has been identified as a determinant of Māori cultural identity, it seems reasonable to assume that the recipients of the Te Rau Puawai bursary may also score highly on measures of Māori cultural identity. If this is so, then the findings of high levels of cultural identity in the present sample may not be representative of the wider population of Māori tertiary students.

To counter each of these issues and obtain a more accurate view of the associations between academic self-enhancement, Māori cultural identity and the other variables detailed in the present research, future studies may aspire to obtain an increased number and a more diverse population of Māori students. For example, this may be achieved through utilising the academic registers of tertiary education institutions throughout the country, to determine students who ethnically identify as Māori, and subsequently seeking their participation (Bennett, 2001).

#### **4.2.2 Variable Limitations**

As previously mentioned, difficulties have been raised regarding valid measurement and use of the self-enhancement construct (e.g., Assor et al., 1990; Kenny & Albright, 1987). In the present research, three particular points of concern became relevant. Firstly, determination of the type of rating that was specifically indicative of a tendency to self-enhance was an issue, as responses to academic self-enhancement and the above-average effect could be differentiated. That is, academic self-enhancement is an individual's objective

perception regarding their academic abilities in comparison to others, and the above-average effect is a subjective assessment of one's traits. Presumably, the psychological processes underlying each type of response are different. Which response best captures, and validly measures the construct of self-enhancement requires further exploration.

Whether self-enhancement and self-esteem are synonymous constructs was also subject for concern. That is, the outcomes associated with each of the constructs cannot readily be differentiated. Given this, the underlying psychological processes determining the manifestation of these outcomes, must be the same, with the only difference between the constructs being in the way they are conceptualised. Similarly, variations in modesty levels have been found to parallel levels of self-enhancement (Kurman, 2003), such that as levels of one variable increase a simultaneous decrease occurs in the other variable's levels. This had led to the suggestion that self-enhancement and modesty are synonymous constructs. Again, further exploration of how these constructs relate to each other, is required. In order to do this, future research may like to focus on exploring the underlying processes associated with each of the variables. Comparisons of these processes could then be made to provide greater clarity on whether the constructs are synonymous, or whether they can be differentiated.

### **4.3 Conclusion**

To the author's knowledge, the associations among individualism/collectivism, Māori cultural identity, self-enhancement and modesty, have not previously been investigated in a sample of New Zealand Māori. Therefore, the main caveat of the present research is that it was largely exploratory and correlational, rather than causative, by nature. Despite this and the described limitations, the research reported herein identified the prevalence of horizontal collectivism within a sample of Māori who strongly identify with the culture. Significant associations between horizontal collectivism and self-enhancement, as well as self-enhancement and modesty were also found. Consequently, such findings

may be useful for providing some insights into the underlying processes, structures, beliefs, and norms that govern the functioning of Māori as an ethnic and cultural unit. The importance and usefulness of insights into these processes, is such that they could serve as an informative tool when considering a variety of social phenomena associated with being Māori.

## REFERENCES

- Assor, A., Tzelgov, J., Thein, R., Ilardi, B. C., & Connell, P. (1990). Assessing the correlates of over- and underrating of academic competence. A conceptual clarification and methodological proposal. *Child Development, 61*, 2085-2097.
- Bennett, S. T. (2001). *Cultural identity and academic achievement of Māori undergraduate university students*. Unpublished Masters thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Blatt, S. J., D'affliti, J. P., & Quinlan, D. M. (1979). *Depressive Experience Questionnaire*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bochner, S. (1994). Cross-cultural differences in the self-concept: A test of Hofstede's individualism/collectivism distinction. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*, 273-283.
- Brown, J. D. (1998). *The self*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, J. D., & Kobayashi, C. (2002). Self-enhancement in Japan and America. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 5*, 145-168.
- Cialdini, R.B., Wosinka, W., Dabul, A. J., Whetstone-Dion, R., & Heszen, I. (1998). When social role salience leads to social role rejection: Modest self-representation among women and men in two cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24* (5), 473-482.
- Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2001). Cultural orientations in the United States. (Re)Examining differences among ethnic groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32* (3), 348-364.

- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95 (3), 542-575.
- Dunning, D., Meyerowitz, J. A., & Holzberg, A. D. (1989). Ambiguity and self-evaluation: The role of idiosyncratic trait definition in self-serving appraisals of ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1082-1090.
- Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora: The dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Gouveia, V. V., Clemente, M., & Espinosa, P. (2003). The horizontal and vertical attributes of individualism and collectivism in a Spanish population. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 143 (1), 43-63.
- Gouveia, V. V., de Albuquerque, F. J. B., Clemente, M., & Espinosa, P. (2002). Human values and social identities: A study in two collectivist cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37 (6), 333-342.
- Greenfield, P. M. (1999). *Three approaches to the psychology of culture: Where do they come from?* Presented at the third conference of the Asian Association of Social Psychology, Taiwan.
- Gurung, R. A. R., & Mehta, V. (2001). Relating ethnic identity, acculturation, and attitudes toward treating minority clients. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7 (2), 139-151.
- Gushue, G. V., & Constantine, M. G. (2003). Examining individualism, collectivism, and self-differentiation in African American college women. *Journal of Mental Health Counselling*, 25 (1), 1-15.
- Harrington, L., & Liu, J. H. (2002). Self-enhancement and attitudes toward high achievers: A bicultural view of the independent and interdependent self. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33 (1), 37-55.

- Heine, S. J. (2001). Self as cultural product: An examination of East Asian and North American selves. *Journal of Personality, 69* (6), 881-906.
- Heine, S. J., Kitayama, S., & Lehman, D. R. (2001). Cultural differences in self-evaluation: Japanese readily accept negative self-relevant information. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32* (4), 434-443.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997). The cultural construction of self-enhancement: An examination of group serving biases. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72* (6), 1268-1283.
- Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review, 106*, 766-794.
- Henare, M. (1988). Nga tikanga me nga ritenga o te ao Māori-Standards and foundations of Māori society. *Royal Commission on Social Policy, 3* (1), 39-69.
- Hirini, P. (1996). *Whakaro mo te aria whanaungatanga: He ata rapu. Measurement of the whanaungatanga concept: An exploratory study.* Unpublished Masters thesis, Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Jetten, J., Postmes, T., & Mcauliffe, B. J. (2002). 'We're all individuals': Group norms of individualism and collectivism, levels of identification and identity threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 32*, 189-207.
- Ji, L. J., Schwarz, N., & Nisbett, R. E. (2000). Culture, autobiographical memory, and behavioural frequency reports: Measurement issues in cross-cultural studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 585-593.

- Kammann, R., & Flett, R. (1983). *Sourcebook for measuring well-being with Affectometer 2*. Dunedin: Why Not? Foundation.
- Kaplan, H. I., & Sadock, B. J. (1998). *Synopsis of psychiatry. Behavioral sciences/Clinical psychiatry*. (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Baltimore: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.
- Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S., Gelfand, M. J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69* (5), 925-937.
- Kimmelmeier, M., Burnstein, E., Genkova, K. K. P., Kanagawa, C., Hirshberg, M. S., Erb, H. P., Wiczorkowska, G., & Noels, K. A. (2003). Individualism, collectivism, and authoritarianism in seven societies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *34* (3), 304-322.
- Kenny, D. A., & Albright, L. (1987). Accuracy in interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *102*, 390-402.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Kurokawa, M. (2000). Culture, emotion, and well-being: Good feelings in Japan and the United States. *Cognition and Emotion*, *14* (1), 93-124.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72* (6), 1245-1267.
- Kobayashi, C., & Brown, J. D. (2003). Self-esteem and self-enhancement in Japan and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *34* (5), 567-580.

- Kurman, J. (2001). Self-enhancement: Is it restricted to individualistic cultures? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27 (12), 1705-1716.
- Kurman, J. (2003). Why is self-enhancement low in certain collectivist cultures? An investigation of two competing explanations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34 (5), 496-510.
- Kurman, J., & Eshel, Y. (1998). Self-enhancement, generality level of self-evaluation, and emotional adjustment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138 (5), 549-563.
- Kurman, J., & Sriram, N. (2002). Interrelationships among vertical and horizontal collectivism, modesty, and self-enhancement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33 (1), 71-86.
- Kurman, J., Yoshihara-Tanaka, C., & Elkoshi, T. (2003). Is self-enhancement negatively related to constructive self-criticism? Self-enhancement and self-criticism in Israel and in Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34 (1), 24-37.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). A collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (5), 568-579.
- Mental Health Commission. (2003). *Report on progress 2001–2002: Towards implementing the Blueprint for Mental Health Services in New Zealand*. Wellington: Mental Health Commission.
- Ministry of Social Development. (2003). *The social report: Te pūrongo oranga tangata 2003*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

- Ministry of Social Policy. (2001). *The social report: Te pūrongo oranga tangata 2001. Indicators of social well-being in New Zealand*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Policy.
- Metge, J. (1995). *New growth from old: The whānau in the modern world*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Murray, J. R., & Flett, R. A. (2003). *Influential factors moderating academic enjoyment/motivation and psychological well-being for Māori university students at Massey University*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Massey University, Department of Psychology.
- Nelson, M. R., & Shavitt, S. (2002). Horizontal and vertical individualism and achievement values. A multimethod examination of Denmark and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33* (5), 439-458.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128* (1), 3-72.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosnow, R. L. & Rosenthal, R. (1989). Statistical procedures and the justification of knowledge in psychological science. *American Psychologist, 44*, 1276-1284.
- Sawicka, T., Barr, K., Grace, D., Grenside, L., Thomson, J., & Williams, G. (1998). *Forming a cultural identity: What does it mean to be ethnic?* Retrieved 4<sup>th</sup> May 2004, from <http://www.vuw.ac.nz/yfp/papers/ethnicity.html>.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*, 139-157.

- Schweder, R. A. (1990). Cultural psychology: What is it? In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Schweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural Psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 1-43). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84* (1), 60-79.
- Singelis, T. M., Bond, M. H., Sharkey, W. F., & Siu Yiu Lai, C. (1999). Unpacking culture's influence on self-esteem and embarrassability. The role of self-construals. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30* (3), 315-341.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29* (3), 240-275.
- Snibbe, A. C., Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Suzuki, T. (2003). They saw a game. A Japanese and American (football) field study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34* (5), 581-595.
- Soh, S., & Leong, F. T. L. (2002). Validity of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism in Singapore: Relationships with values and interests. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33* (1), 3-15.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2001). *Māori*. Retrieved 31<sup>st</sup> May 2004, from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/pasfull/pasfull.nsf/web/Media+Release+2001+Census+Snapshot+4+Māori>.
- Steele, C. M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol 21, pp. 181-227). San Diego: Academic Press.

- Strunk, D. R., & Chang, E. C. (1999). Distinguishing between fundamental dimensions of individualism-collectivism: Relations to sociopolitical attitudes and beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27*, 665-671.
- Tabachnik, B., & Fidell, L. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. California: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Te Hoe Nuku Roa Research Team. (1999). *Te Hoe Nuku Roa source document: Baseline history. Māori profiles research project*. Palmerston North: Te Pūtahi-ā-toi, Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Te Rau Puawai. (2004). *Māori mental health career opportunities*. Retrieved 31<sup>st</sup> May 2004, from <http://te-rau-puawai.massey.ac.nz/general/index.html>.
- Thomas, D. C., & Perkerti, A. A. (2003). Effect of culture on situational determinants of exchange behaviour in organizations. A comparison of New Zealand and Indonesia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34* (3), 269-281.
- Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989* (pp. 41-133). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74* (1), 118-128.
- Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 133-160.

van Baaren, R. B., Maddux, W. W., Chartrand, T. L., de Bouter, C., & van Knippenberg, A. (2003). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84* (5), 1093-1102.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54* (6), 1063-1070.

Whetstone, M. R., Okun, M. A., & Cialdini, R. B. (1992). *The Modest Responding scale*. Paper presented at the convention of the American Psychological Society, San Diego, CA.

## APPENDIX A: Information Cover Sheet

### Dimensions of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement: A study of New Zealand Māori

#### INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Ko Taranaki te maunga  
Ko Mohakatino te awa  
Ko Tokomaru te waka  
Ko Te Tatau o te Pō te marae  
Ko Te Ati Awa te iwi  
Ko Natasha Tassell tōku ingoa

#### **Who is doing this study and what is it about?**

Kia ora koutou. My name is Natasha Tassell and I am performing this research as part of my Masterate degree at Massey University, Palmerston North. My supervisor is Dr Ross Flett, a senior lecturer in the School of Psychology at Massey University. If you would like to contact either Dr Flett or myself, our details can be found at the end of this questionnaire.

In this study I will be examining Māori cultural identity, and its relationship to individualism/collectivism, and academic self-enhancement. The primary goal of this research is to examine how these factors may impact on Māori.

#### ***Who can participate in the study?***

If you are studying or have recently studied (within the past year) at a tertiary institution (e.g., University, Wānanga, Polytechnic) and are descended from or identify as Māori, then it would be great if you could participate.

#### **What will you be asked to do?**

If you choose to participate in the study, it will involve you filling out the following questionnaire. This will take about 10 minutes. You have the right to withdraw from filling out the questionnaire at any time, and you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to. You do not need to write your name on the questionnaire, and the information you provide will be held in complete confidence by Dr Flett and myself, and will only be used for the purposes of this research. At any time you may ask questions about the study and a summary of the research findings will be sent to you should you request so.

## Dimensions of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement Questionnaire

### INSTRUCTIONS

Please remember:

- The information you give is confidential to the researchers
- There are no right or wrong answers. What is important is that you are honest in answering the questions
- It is suggested that you complete the questionnaire alone, that is, without any discussion with others
- If you are not sure about a question or how to answer questions, please feel free to contact Dr Flett or myself for help
- If you choose to complete the questionnaire, please place it in the Freepost, self-addressed envelope provided (no stamp required)
- At the back of the questionnaire you are offered the opportunity of receiving a group summary of the research results. If you wish for this to be posted to you, please indicate by ticking the box on the form provided, and returning the form in the Freepost, self-addressed envelope provided (no stamp required)

Thank you for your time and cooperation in completing this questionnaire, we really appreciate your help.

Kei te mihi ki ā koe mō tō tautoko o tēnei rangahau

Na Natasha Tassell,  
Masterate Student,  
School of Psychology,  
Massey University,  
Private Bag 11222.  
Palmerston North.

Questionnaire Code Number: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B – Questionnaire

### Dimensions of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement Questionnaire: SECTION A

First of all, we have some general demographic questions. Please write your answers in the spaces provided or *CIRCLE* the answer that best describes you.

1. Are you:

1 = Male

2 = Female

2. What age group are you in?

1 = 18 - 23 years

2 = 24 - 30 years

3 = 31 - 40 years

4 = above 41 years

3. What is your highest educational qualification?

---

---

4. Are you currently studying?

1 = Yes Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

2 = No

5. What are your tribal / iwi affiliations?

---

---

### Dimensions of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement Questionnaire: SECTION B

Next, I am wanting to know some aspects about your Māori cultural identity. Please write your answers in the spaces provided or *CIRCLE* the answer that best describes you.

6. If you had to choose one of these options that best describe you, which would you choose?

1 = A Kiwi

2 = A New Zealander

3 = Māori / Pākehā

4 = Part Māori

5 = A Polynesian

6 = A Māori

7 = Other Please describe\_\_\_\_\_

7. **How many generations of your Māori ancestry can you name?**
- 1 = One generation (parents)
  - 2 = Two generations (grandparents)
  - 3 = Three generations (great-grandparents)
  - 4 = More than three generations
8. **Have you ever been to a marae?**
- 1 = Yes How often in the past 12 months?\_\_\_\_\_
  - 2 = No
9. **How would you rate your knowledge of marae tikanga?**
- 1 = Excellent                      2 = Very good                      3 = Good
  - 4 = Fair                              5 = Poor
10. **From your own personal point of view what type of funeral arrangement is preferable? (Please circle only one)**
- 1 = Marae tangihanga                      2 = House service
  - 3 = Funeral chapel service                      4 = Service in a church
  - 5 = Other
11. **In terms of your involvement with your whānau, would you say that your whānau plays...**
- 1 = A very large part in your life                      2 = A large part in your life
  - 3 = A small part in your life                      4 = No part in your life
12. **Do you have financial interest in Māori land as an owner, part owner, or beneficiary?**
- 1 = Yes                      2 = No                      3 = Not sure / Don't know
13. **How would you rate your overall ability with Te Reo Māori?**
- 1 = Excellent                      2 = Very good                      3 = Good
  - 4 = Fair                      5 = Poor                      6 = Not applicable

- 14. How did you acquire your ability with Te Reo Māori?**
- 1 = Learned as a first language  
 2 = Taught yourself  
 3 = Learned as a second language from family / whānau  
 4 = Learned as a second language at an educational institution  
 5 = Other Please specify\_\_\_\_\_
- 15. If you wanted to increase your ability to speak and understand Māori language, what would you do?**
- 1 = Teach yourself  
 2 = Learn from a Kaumātua  
 3 = Learn from whānau who know Māori  
 4 = Enrol in a Māori language course at a polytechnic or university  
 5 = Enrol in some other Māori language course  
 6 = Other Please specify\_\_\_\_\_
- 16. In your household, is Māori spoken:**
- 1 = More often than three years ago  
 2 = Less often than three years ago  
 3 = About the same now as three years ago  
 4 = Not applicable (i.e., not spoken in your household)
- 17. In three years time do you think your overall ability with the Māori language will be:**
- 1 = Better than it is now                      2 = Worse than it is now  
 3 = About the same as now                      4 = Don't know
- 18. Which statement best describes the types of people you have the most contact with in general?**
- 1 = Mainly Māori                                      2 = Some Māori  
 3 = Very few Māori                                      4 = No Māori

**Dimensions of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement: SECTION C**

This next set of questions concerns how you feel about other people, your interactions with other people and society, and, how you feel about yourself. Please **CIRCLE** the number that best describes your agreement with the following statements:

*1 = Strongly disagree    2 = Disagree    3 = Disagree somewhat    4 = Normal  
5 = Agree somewhat    6 = Agree    7 =  
Strongly agree*

19.    **I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk with people**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
20.    **My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
21.    **I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
22.    **Winning is everything**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
23.    **One should live one's life independently of others**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
24.    **What happens to me is my own doing**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
25.    **I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
26.    **It annoys me when other people perform better than I do**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
27.    **It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7
28.    **It is important to me that I do my job better than others**  
          1        2        3        4        5        6        7

29. I like sharing little things with my neighbours  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. We should keep our aging parents with us at home  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. The well-being of my co-workers is important to me  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35. Children should feel honoured if their parents receive a distinguished award  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36. I often do "my own thing"  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37. Competition is the law of nature  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38. If a co-worker gets a prize, I would feel proud  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39. I am a unique individual  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40. To me, pleasure is spending time with others  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
42. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43. I like my privacy  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
44. Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
45. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
46. I feel good when I cooperate with others  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47. I hate to disagree with others in my group  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
48. Some people emphasise winning; I am not one of them  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
49. Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
50. When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
51. I think cooperation in the workplace is more important than competition  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
52. I think it is important that everyone has equal access to healthcare  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Dimension of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement: SECTION D**

The following questions relate to how you feel about your educational abilities and your educational institution. Please relate your answer to how you felt in your most recent study period. Please **CIRCLE** the answer that best describes your agreement with the following:

**53. How successful were you in your [relevant studies] compared to your fellow students?**

- |                             |                    |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 = Not successful at all   | 2 = Not successful |
| 3 = Somewhat not successful | 4 = Normal         |
| 5 = Somewhat successful     | 6 = Successful     |
| 7 = Very successful         |                    |

**54. Are you generally a good student?**

- |                                    |                            |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 = I'm a very poor student        | 2 = I'm a poor student     |
| 3 = I'm somewhat of a poor student | 4 = I'm an average student |
| 5 = I'm somewhat of a good student | 6 = I'm a good student     |
| 7 = I'm a very good student        |                            |

**55. How frequently do you think about leaving your tertiary institution?**

- |                |                  |
|----------------|------------------|
| 1 = Never      | 2 = Sometimes    |
| 3 = Frequently | 4 = All the time |

**56. How likely is it that you will search for another tertiary institution to attend?**

- |                       |                     |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 = Not at all likely | 2 = Somewhat likely |
| 3 = Very likely       | 4 = Definitely      |

**57. How likely is it that you will actually leave your tertiary institution within the next year?**

- |                       |                     |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 = Not at all likely | 2 = Somewhat likely |
| 3 = Very likely       | 4 = Definitely      |



67. **If I've done something well, I like to tell people about it**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
68. **I get upset at the thought of having to describe my positive traits to others**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
69. **Even if you've "got it", you certainly should not "flaunt it"**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
70. **I feel uncomfortable whenever I have to describe my successes to others**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
71. **It is a real social mistake to show off in public**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
72. **Whenever I accomplish something important, I get excited telling others about it**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
73. **Bragging on oneself in a group is always socially inappropriate**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
74. **Telling people about my strengths and successes has always been an embarrassing thing for me**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
75. **I prefer to keep my accomplishments to myself than talk about them**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
76. **I have a hard time describing myself to others in positive terms, even when I know I've done well**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
77. **If I've played a big role in bringing about some kind of success, I don't feel reluctant telling people about it**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
78. **I've always felt that bragging in the presence of others is one of the best ways to become disliked**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
79. **My friends will tell you that, when I accomplish something, I'm not shy about tooting my own horn**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
80. **When someone asks me to describe a recent success, I tend to downplay what I've accomplished**  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

81. I believe it's impolite to talk excessively about one's achievement, even if they are outstanding  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
82. When people tell me about one of their successes, I like to tell them about one of mine  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
83. In describing my positive qualities to another person, I feel awkward  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Dimensions of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement Questionnaire: SECTION 6**

This section looks at how you generally feel. Please *CIRCLE* the answer that best describes how you feel on average.

*1 = Not at all    2 = Occasionally    3 = Some of the time    4 = Often  
5 = All the time*

- |     |               |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 84. | Hopeless      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 85. | Depressed     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 86. | Insignificant | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 87. | Confused      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 88. | Useful        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 89. | Clear-headed  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 90. | Optimistic    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 91. | Enthusiastic  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Dimensions of Culture, Cultural Identity, and Academic Self-Enhancement Questionnaire: FEEDBACK REQUEST**

If you would like a summary of the study results, please tick the box below and provide details of the best way you would like to receive feedback in the space below. Please note that the summary that you will receive will be an overall group summary, and individuals will not be identifiable.

Name:

Address:

Email:

If you have indicated that you would like a summary of the study results, please place this form in the small Freepost, self-addressed envelope provided.

Thank you for your time and co-operation in completing this questionnaire. Your help is greatly appreciated. Please remember any questions or comments are most welcome. Contact details are given below. Once you have completed this questionnaire, please place it in the prepaid envelope provided and send.

Once again thank you for your participation.

No reira, tēnā koutou katoa.

Natasha Tassell  
Masterate Student,  
School of Psychology,  
Private Bag 11 222,  
Massey University,  
Palmerston North.

[N.A.Tassell@massey.ac.nz](mailto:N.A.Tassell@massey.ac.nz)

Dr Ross Flett  
Senior Lecturer,  
School of Psychology,  
Private Bag 11 222,  
Massey University,  
Palmerston North.

[R.A.Flett@massey.ac.nz](mailto:R.A.Flett@massey.ac.nz)

## APPENDIX C – Scoring for Māori Cultural Identity Measure

1. **If you had to choose one of these options that best describe you, which would you choose?**

- |                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 = A Kiwi         | 2 = A New Zealander   |
| 3 = Māori / Pākehā | 4 = Part Māori        |
| 5 = A Polynesian   | 6 = A Māori           |
| 7 = Other          | Please describe _____ |

- Responses of 1, 2, or 5 were scored as 0
- Responses of 3, 4, or 6 were scored as 1

2. **How many generations of your Māori ancestry can you name?**

- 1 = One generation (parents)
- 2 = Two generations (grandparents)
- 3 = Three generations (great-grandparents)
- 4 = More than three generations

- Responses of 1 or 2 were scored as 0
- Responses of 3 or 4 were scored as 1

3. **Have you ever been to a marae?**

- |         |        |
|---------|--------|
| 1 = Yes | 2 = No |
|---------|--------|
- How often in the past 12 months?** \_\_\_\_\_

- Responses of 1 or 2 were scored as 0
- Responses of 3 or 4 were scored as 1

4. **How would you rate your knowledge of marae tikanga?**

- |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| 1 = Excellent | 2 = Very good |
| 3 = Good      | 4 = Fair      |
| 5 = Poor      |               |

- Responses of 3, 4 or 5 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1 or 2 were scored as 1

**5. From your own personal point of view what type of funeral arrangement is preferable? (Please circle only one)**

- 1 = Marae tangihanga                      2 = House service  
 3 = Funeral chapel service              4 = Service in a church  
 5 = Other

- Responses of 2, 3, 4 or 5 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1 were scored as 1

**6. In terms of your involvement with your whānau, would you say that your whānau plays...**

- 1 = A very large part in your life              2 = A large part in your life  
 3 = A small part in your life                      4 = No part in your life

- Responses of 3 or 4 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1 or 2 were scored as 1

**7. Do you have financial interest in Māori land as an owner, part owner, or beneficiary?**

- 1 = Yes    2 = No  
 3 = Not sure / Don't know

- Responses of 2 or 3 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1 were scored as 1

**8. How would you rate your overall ability with Te Reo Māori?**

- 1 = Excellent                                      2 = Very good  
 3 = Good    4 = Fair  
 5 = Poor    6 = Not applicable

- Responses of 4, 5 or 6 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1, 2 or 3 were scored as 1

**9. How did you acquire your ability with Te Reo Māori?**

1 = Learned as a first language

2 = Taught yourself

3 = Learned as a second language from family / whānau

4 = Learned as a second language at an educational institution

5 = Other Please specify\_\_\_\_\_

- Responses of 2 or 4 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1, 3 or 5 were scored as 1

**10. If you wanted to increase your ability to speak and understand Māori language, what would you do?**

1 = Teach yourself

2 = Learn from a Kaumātua

3 = Learn from whānau who know Māori

4 = Enrol in a Māori language course at a polytechnic or university

5 = Enrol in some other Māori language course

6 = Other Please specify\_\_\_\_\_

- Responses of 1, 4 or 5 were scored as 0
- Responses of 2, 3 or 6 were scored as 1

**11. In your household, is Māori spoken:**

1 = More often than three years ago

2 = Less often than three years ago

3 = About the same now as three years ago

4 = Not applicable (i.e., Māori not spoken in your household)

- Responses of 2 or 4 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1 or 3 were scored as 1

**12. In three years time do you think your overall ability with the Māori language will be:**

1 = Better than it is now

2 = Worse than it is now

3 = About the same as it is now

4 = Don't know

- Responses of 2 or 4 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1 or 3 were scored as 1

**13. Which statement best describes the types of people you have the most contact with in general?**

1 = Mainly Māori

2 = Some Māori

3 = Very few Māori

4 = No Māori

- Responses of 2, 3 or 4 were scored as 0
- Responses of 1 were scored as 1