

Cultural Dimensions, Gender, and the Nature of Self-concept: A Fourteen-country Study

David Watkins

University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Adebowale Akande

University of the Western Cape, South Africa

James Fleming

*State University of California,
United States of America*

Maznah Ismail

University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Kent Lefner

*State University of California,
United States of America*

Murari Regmi

Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Sue Watson

Massey University, New Zealand

Jiayuan Yu

Nanjing Normal University, China

John Adair

University of Manitoba, Canada

Christopher Cheng

City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Andres Gerong

*University of San Carlos,
Philippines*

Dennis McInerney

University of Western Sydney, Australia

Elias Mpfu

*University of Zimbabwe,
Zimbabwe*

Sunita Singh-Sengupta

Magadh University, India

Habtamu Wondimu

Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

Ratings of the importance of and satisfaction with 20 areas of the self were obtained from 3604 first or second year social science undergraduates from 14 countries (15 cultures). Factor analysis at the culture by gender level supported four factors for both sets of ratings. The resulting factor scores were analyzed for mean differences according to the cultural dimension of Individualism-Collectivism by Gender and by correlations with other cultural dimensions and economic indicators. It was found that participants from the 10 collectivist cultures placed greater salience for their self-concepts on "family values" than did those from the individualist cultures. However, this cultural difference was not found for "social relationships". The expected gender differences, with females valuing "family values" and "social relationships" more highly, were found only for the individualist countries. The findings indicate that there may be a strong cultural level interaction effect between gender and Individualism-Collectivism on the nature of self-conceptions, and that the "family" and "social" aspects of self-concept in collectivist countries need to be considered separately.

Cette étude rapporte les scores d'importance et de satisfaction attribués à 20 aspects du soi par 3604 étudiants prégradués de première ou deuxième année en sciences sociales, provenant de 14 pays différents (15 cultures). L'analyse factorielle sur le niveau culutre \times sexe indique la présence de quatre facteurs pour les deux ensembles de scores. Ces scores factoriels sont analysés quant aux différences de moyennes selon la dimension culturelle Individualisme-Collectivisme \times Sexe et par les corrélations avec d'autres dimensions culturelles et indicateurs économiques. Les résultats montrent que les participants et participantes des 10 cultures collectivistes mettent davantage l'accent sur les valeurs familiales

Requests for reprints or further information should be sent to David Watkins, Department of Education, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong (Fax: 852 2858 5649; E-mail: HRFEWDA@HKUCC.HKU.HK). This research was funded by a grant to the first author from the Committee on Research and Conference Grants at the University of Hong Kong.

dans leur concept de soi que ceux et celles des cultures individualistes. Cependant, cette différence culturelle ne se manifeste pas pour la variable "relations sociales". Les différences attendues en fonction du sexe, à savoir une plus grande valeur accordée aux "valeurs familiales" et aux "relations sociales" par les femmes que les hommes, n'apparaissent que dans les cultures individualistes. Ces résultats indiquent qu'il y aurait un fort effet culturel de l'interaction entre le sexe et l'Individualisme-Collectivisme sur la nature des conceptions du soi et que les aspects "familiaux" et "sociaux" du concept de soi doivent être conçus séparément dans les cultures collectivistes.

INTRODUCTION

Since the days of William James (1890) many researchers have pointed to the need for self-esteem measuring instruments to be based on components of the self that are salient to individual subjects (Fleming & Courtney, 1984; Hattie, 1992; Pelham & Swann, 1989; Rosenberg, 1979; Watkins, 1978). Salience in this respect is a function of self-related values that may well vary according to variables such as age (Harter, 1985), gender (Josephs, Markus, & Tafarodi, 1992), and cultural dimensions such as individualism-collectivism (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). According to the last three papers, the independent concept of self portrayed in the literature and on which the great majority of existing measuring instruments are based (Byrne, 1996; Harter, 1985; Hattie, 1992; Marsh, 1988; Rosenberg, 1979; Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976; Wylie, 1989) is not appropriate for the majority of respondents from non-Western cultures or for many women from any culture. However, the empirical support for such claims can be questioned. The purpose of this research is to investigate culture by gender differences in the source and level of self-esteem by sampling undergraduate college students in a range of countries varying in underlying cultural dimensions thought to be relevant to the self-concept. The resulting analysis will be at the country rather than the individual level. This investigation is a major component of a research programme designed to probe the impact of culture and gender on the nature of self-concept using different methodological approaches and samples of children, college students, and adults from different ethnic groups both within and across a wide range of countries.

Cultural Dimensions and the Self-concept

Recent major reviews have suggested that in more individualistic, typically Western cultures a group's goals are subordinated to those of the

individual, resulting in a relatively independent or individualistic construal of self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). Whereas individuals in such cultures tend to strive for autonomy, in more collectivist cultures a person is likely to be attached to a few groups whose goals are all-important and which are major influences in defining his or her identity. The result in these latter cultures, it is argued, is typically a more interdependent or collectivistic construal of the self.

Triandis supported his claims with several small studies of university students in a number of cultures where he asked each subject to complete 20 sentences each beginning "I am . . ." (referred to as the Twenty Statements Test or TST; Kuhn & McPartland, 1954). Further support came from the work of Cousins (1989), who also used both the original and a modified version of the TST with American and Japanese high school and college subjects. However, Cousins warned that the Japanese were more used to thinking about themselves within specific social contexts so the original TST, which required them to describe a decontextualized "self", was an artificial task for them.

A number of other studies have concluded that respondents from the USA tend to provide self-descriptions that are qualitatively different from those of respondents from China, India, and Japan (Bond & Cheung, 1983; Dhawan, Roseman, Naidu, Thapa, & Rettek, 1995; Ip & Bond, 1995; Schweder & Bourne, 1982). Moreover, recent in-depth indigenous studies of self-conceptions have provided rather different models of self from those developed in Western research (for example, Enriquez, 1993, with Filipinos; Hsu, 1985, with Chinese; Mpofo, 1994, with Zimbabweans; Yamaguchi, 1994, with Japanese). These investigations have been relatively consistent in finding that non-Western subjects were more likely to report possessing a relational, collectivist, or interdependent self-conception that contrasted with the idiocentric, independent, or individualistic self typically reported by Western (or at least American) subjects.

The cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism (I-C) seemed to be an obvious choice

as an explanatory variable for cross-cultural differences in self-conception. This dimension was used by Hofstede (1980, 1983) to describe a continuum from individualism, where persons are considered as distinct units clearly separable from their social context, to collectivism, where people think of themselves not so much as separate entities but rather as members of the groups to which they belong. Hofstede compared survey data from samples of IBM employees to construct an index of individualism-collectivism (I-C) and three other dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity/femininity for 50 countries plus 3 multicountry regions.

However, the empirical back-up for a cultural level I-C explanation of cross-cultural differences in the nature of self-concept is still rather limited. As discussed above much of the support to date comes from two-country etic-type research (typically America vs. India, China, or Japan) or by contrasting findings from an emic study of the self in a non-Western society with Western models of self. Such studies are inadequate for demonstrating that a generalizable cultural dimension such as individualism-collectivism underlies the differences found between respondents of the different countries. Cross-cultural methodologists have pointed out that to avoid false generalizations based on irrelevant differences between any two cultures we need to do at least a *four*-culture study (Bond, 1994; Schwartz, 1994; Triandis, 1989). In this case data based on the self-conceptions of matched participants from a minimum of two individualist and two collectivist cultures would be needed. Then it would at least be possible to test whether the self-conceptions of the two individualist (and also the two collectivist) culture subjects were *similar* to each other and then test that there were *differences* according to the supposedly underlying I-C dimension. The more cultures sampled the greater the confidence that could be placed in such an interpretation.

Prior to this research programme there have been two three-culture and two larger studies. In the former category, Bochner (1994) found that, as hypothesized, adults from a collectivist culture (Malaysia) gave statistically significantly more group and fewer idiocentric self-descriptions to the TST than did subjects from the individualist cultures of Australia and Britain. Unfortunately the sample size (a total of 78 for the 3 countries combined) was rather too small for much confidence to be placed in the results. The second three-culture study (Bond & Cheung, 1983) casts

doubt on the validity of a simple I-C/self-concept relationship. Bond and Cheung reported a clear pattern of findings with their university student samples with very similar responses by their individualist (USA) and one of the collectivist samples (Hong Kong Chinese), but their other collectivist sample (Japan) was very different. One of the larger studies was that of Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990) who, by analysing responses of Illinois, Greek, Hawaiian (of both European and Asian background), Hong Kong, and Chinese psychology college students to the TST, showed that the percentage of the subjects' responses that were linked to a social entity increased as expected by the supposed degree of collectivism of the cultural group to which they belonged. Although this finding was encouraging, three of the groups sampled were American and participants were undergraduate college students (except for the People's Republic of China sample, who were not only small in number but were also older graduate students). Possible gender differences in the relationship between the I/C dimension and the self-concept were not considered. Results of the first two investigations in this research programme discussed later suggest that this may be a serious weakness.

Gender and the Self

Research into gender differences and the self-concept has focused primarily on possible structural and mean differences in self-esteem. Confirmatory factor analytic research has indicated that, at least for North American adolescents, a structural model based on the hierarchical, multifaceted model of self proposed by Shavelson et al. (1976) was appropriate for both genders (Byrne, Shavelson, & March, 1992). Moreover, contrary to popular stereotypes, a meta-analysis concluded that there was little empirical evidence of gender differences in overall self-esteem but differences existed at lower levels of the hierarchy, with males tending to report higher mathematics self-esteem but lower verbal self-esteem than females (Hattie, 1992).

However, Josephs et al. (1992) pointed out that little attention has been paid in such research to the basis of self-esteem. They argued that self-esteem is related at least in part to how well men or women feels they have satisfied culturally mandated norms that differ according to gender. For women, sensitivity, nurturance, and interdependence are typically expected whereas, for men, being independent, autonomous, and superior to

others are often expected. So Josephs et al. proposed that men are more likely to have self-conceptions based on individualist, independent self-cognitions, whereas those of women are relatively more likely to be based on the notion of a collectivist, interdependent self. They supported their claims with data from three small studies of American college students of psychology. But would such hypotheses be confirmed in other cultures?

Contrary evidence was provided by Luk and Bond (1992), who concluded that their sample of Hong Kong male and female university students based their self-esteem on the same dimensions of self-concept. Moreover, a recent article by Kashima et al. (1995) addressed the issue of culture, gender, and the self from the perspective of individualism-collectivism research. Kashima et al. analysed the responses to questionnaire measures of individualistic, relational, and collective dimensions of self-construal originally developed from concepts emic to Japanese culture, by a total of about 1000 introductory psychology students from 5 cultures: 2 supposedly individualist (Australia and mainland USA), 2 thought to be collectivist (Korea and Japan), and 1 "in-between" culture (Hawaii). They concluded that whereas gender differences in self-concept were primarily due to differences in the extent that their respondents thought of themselves as emotionally related to others, such differences between cultures were primarily due to differences in the degree to which their respondents saw themselves as acting as independent agents.

Further evidence that gender differences in the nature of self-concept may not be consistent across cultures came from the first two investigations in this research programme. The first used the instrument also utilized in this study to investigate the basis of self-concept of 609 middle-class adults from Lithuania, Hong Kong, and the USA (Watkins, Yau, et al., 1997). Within-country gender differences in the salience of self-components were much smaller than between-country effects. The second used the TST to explore the self-conceptions of 1580 social science undergraduates from 8 countries, representing 4 individualist and 5 collectivist cultures (Watkins, Adair, et al., 1996). It was concluded that a cultural dimension such as individualism and collectivism was not adequate for explaining cultural differences in self-construal. Moreover, although allocentric or relational self-descriptions were provided significantly more

often by females from their four individualist cultures, two of their five collectivist cultures showed the opposite tendency. To what extent these conflicting findings are due to measurement or sampling issues will require further research, but they do strongly question both the claims by Triandis (1989) and Markus and Kitayama (1991) regarding the role of the I-C dimension and those of Josephs et al. (1992) regarding the role of gender for self-conception, at least in non-Western cultures.

Exploring the Self-concept

The TST has been the primary tool used to date to probe possible gender and culture differences in the nature of self-concept. However, analysis of responses to the TST is relatively subjective and research findings in this area may be instrument-dependent. Moreover, the components of self-concept of men and women and between different cultures may well vary more in terms of salience than of kind. Thus a measuring instrument is required that will allow exploration of the salience of possible self-components. The Adult Sources of Self-Esteem Inventory (ASSEI; Elovson & Fleming, 1989) was designed to fulfil this function. This instrument contains 2 sections with 20 identical items. The first section asks subjects to identify how important each item is to their self-esteem and the second section asks them to rate how satisfied they are with that aspect of themselves (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, have argued that in a cross-cultural setting self-esteem is more appropriately seen in terms of self-satisfaction rather than self-enhancement).

The items of ASSEI were chosen to represent a wide range of sources of self-esteem and to be capable of reflecting gender, developmental, and ethnic differences in the source of self-esteem. ASSEI also allows for calculation of a total self-esteem score, both unweighted and weighted for importance. This is consistent with the position adopted by a number of researchers in the area, that an individual's global self-esteem should reflect that individual's self-satisfaction rating in a number of aspects of the self weighted by the subjective importance of each of these aspects to that individual's self-esteem (Hattie, 1992; Marsh, 1988; I.D. Smith, 1978; Watkins, 1978).

ASSEI has the advantage over measures such as the TST of being objective in measurement but also allowing for individual differences in self-construal. However, it could be argued that the 20

items of ASSEI, although carefully selected to include a wide range of possible self-concept aspects throughout the adult life-span, still may not consider relatively unusual aspects of the self-concept valued by individual subjects or those not salient to American society, where ASSEI was developed. This is particularly the case in cross-cultural research, as it is known that there are cultural differences in value systems (see, for example, Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987). Therefore pilot studies were conducted to explore the bases of self-esteem of students and adults in Australia, Hong Kong, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, and the Philippines. These studies supported the appropriateness of the ASSEI items in a range of cultures. For example, Tam and Watkins (1995) content-analysed the responses (in Chinese) of 281 Hong Kong adults averaging 30 years of age to the open-ended question "What areas of your life are important to you?" and found most of the ASSEI items did reflect the life areas reported by these respondents. Of course it is most unlikely that precisely the same 20 items would be the most salient for individuals within the same culture, let alone across cultures. The aim of ASSEI was to include a range of life areas likely to include the most salient areas for as many adults as possible whatever their culture, gender, religion, etc.

For a US sample, the ASSEI Importance and Satisfaction items were found to have median test-retest reliabilities, over a 2-week period, of .69 and .67, respectively: quite impressive for single items (Davis-Zinner, 1990). The overall unweighted self-satisfaction total score was found to have an excellent internal consistency coefficient alpha of .97 for Turkish students (Inelmen, 1996). The ASSEI total satisfaction score in this former research was also found, as predicted, to correlate moderately highly (.37 and .52) with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) and negatively (-.14 and -.37) with the Neuroticism scale of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire for the total scores unweighted and weighted for importance, respectively. Social desirability, as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne scale, as expected had only a minor influence on these ASSEI satisfaction scores (respective correlations of .28 and .23). Further cross-cultural validity evidence comes from a study of 139 Turkish university students (Inelmen, 1996), which found correlations of .65 and .55 between the ASSEI unweighted and unweighted satisfaction scores and general self-esteem as measured by the Coop-

ersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and from a Swedish study (Watkins, Yau, Dahlin, & Wondimu, 1997), which found a correlation of .45 with self-esteem as assessed by the TST (all correlations are significant at .01 level).

Research Design

This research first involved using ASSEI to survey the importance for the self and self-satisfaction with 20 possible sources of self-esteem in sample of countries designed to represent a range of Western and non-Western countries with differing ethnic groups, religious, and cultural backgrounds. The aim of this research was to investigate culture and gender differences in these responses and their relationship to other culture level data. Previous writers (Hofstede, 1980; Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987) have argued that a cultural rather than an individual level of analysis is often the most appropriate for examining differences among cultures. In the latter study this involved obtaining the means of male and female subjects from each of the countries sampled; then, to minimize any cultural differences in response set, such as acquiescence or extreme responding, each of the values to be analysed was standardized within cultures; the resulting standardized means (the average of the male and female values for each country) were then subjected to a varimax factor analysis and factor scores were obtained for each country: this procedure is known as ecological factor analysis. These factor scores were then used to examine correlations with country level data such as economic indicators and Hofstede's (1983) cultural indices.

However, such a level of analysis precludes the investigation of possible culture gender interactions that are germane to this study. Therefore the above approach was extended to a culture by gender level. After standardization of the importance and satisfaction ratings separately by country (so that the mean and standard deviation of the score distributions were 0.0 and 1.0, respectively) factor analysis was conducted on the means of the males and females sampled for each country. Factor scores were then obtained for males and females from each country and these were used in subsequent Individualism-Collectivism by Gender Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) and to correlate with culture level data such as Gross National Product (GNP) and Hofstede's indices where available. Because of the inevitable sus-

ceptibility of “ecological” factor analysis to doubts about the validity of findings based on data with a low “observation” to “item” ratio (in our case 30:20), a second data analysis approach was used to investigate the factors obtained as advocated by Chinese Cultural Connection (1987). The approach we adopted, involving culture by gender factor analysis of the ranks rather than the means of the ASSEI ratings, also allowed us to test the validity of the standardization process to remove cultural differences in response sets and to cross-validate the “ecological” factor analytic results.

METHOD

Participants

The participants in this study were 3604 first- or second-year undergraduate students studying psychology or education courses. The sampling was restricted to these disciplinary areas to allow more confidence that the differences obtained were not due primarily to differences in values, interests, and personality types commonly found between students enrolling in different subjects (Clark & Trow, 1960). The participants all came from well-known universities in urban areas of their countries or, in the case of South Africa, from universities for black or white students, as they existed at the time of this research, even though it was conducted after the fall of the apartheid regime. Five of the 15 samples were from countries or ethnic groups considered as Individualist in the indices of Hofstede (1983): Australia (34 males, 170 females), Canada (67 males, 139 females), New Zealand (43 males, 108 females), United States of America (201 males, 192 females) and white South Africans (74 males, 105 females). The remaining 10 samples were from countries or ethnic groups that were Collectivist in nature according either to the indices provided by Hofstede (1983) or seemed to clearly belong to that category: China (90 males, 99 females), Ethiopia (147 males, 18 females), Hong Kong (175 males, 183 females), India (110 males, 105 females), Malaysia (75 males, 185 females), Nepal (205 males, 177 females), Nigeria (71 males, 122 females), Philippines (48 males, 116 females), Zimbabwe (147 males, 138 females), and black South Africans (46 males, 124 females).

The Instrument

ASSEI is a 20-item inventory that requests each respondent to rate on a 1 (very low) to 10 (very high) scale the importance for him- or herself and his or her satisfaction with different aspects of a person’s self-concept such as the physical, social, ethical, familial, and intellectual (see Appendices). For the Chinese, Indian, and Malaysian respondents each item was translated into the local language by teams of bilingual social scientists using the approved translation/back-translation method (Brislin, 1986). In Nepal pilot studies showed that greater reliability was found with an English rather than Nepali version of ASSEI (English was the medium of instruction).

RESULTS

The means and ranks of the ASSEI importance and satisfaction ratings for the Western and non-Western countries by gender are shown in Appendices 1 to 4¹. Examination of these appendices indicates that the majority of subjects from virtually all countries and both genders considered all the items to be at least fairly important, with family relationships, being friendly, and being honest (all allocentric or collectivist values) as being particularly salient to their self-esteem. But there was also evidence of country and gender differences with, for example, Malaysian males and females and Filipino males placing “Religious beliefs” in their top two rankings for importance but Canadian, New Zealand, and US males and females and Hong Kong and Zimbabwean males placing this item in their lowest two in importance. “Physical abilities” was another item that showed considerable country by gender variation, being of considerable salience to Nigerians and Filipinos, particularly females, and to Canadian, New Zealand, and white South African males.

The data also indicated that the majority of those sampled were quite satisfied with themselves in areas such as their family relationships, family responsibilities, and honesty. However,

¹ The correlation between the importance and satisfaction ratings for each individual is an indication of the degree of self-enhancement. A related paper will analyse the complex issues involved but the median correlations per country varied from .07 (for black South Africa) to .51 (for Ethiopia) and do not seem to vary systematically by gender or Individualism-Collectivism.

there was much less satisfaction with their ability to earn money, their talent, culture, and degree of personal influence. There was also evidence of country and gender variation with, for example, physical abilities being an area of general self-satisfaction for Nigerian and Canadian males and Filipino females but of dissatisfaction for Australian, New Zealand, and US females. The black South Africans, both females and males, not only tended to be particularly dissatisfied with themselves in this area but also in all other areas of self-esteem (all 40 satisfaction means being below 5.0, something rarely found in the corresponding means from elsewhere). Relative to the other four Western countries, the white South Africans sampled also reported fairly low self-satisfaction generally.

Factor Analysis

The 30 country by gender means of each of the 20 importance ratings were first standardized within culture (as described earlier) and these standardized means were then subjected to a principal components factor analysis. The scree test (Cattell, 1966) supported a four-factor solution that accounted for 65.1% of the variance. These four factors were rotated to orthogonal simple structure using the varimax procedure. Items loading above .40 in absolute magnitude are shown in Table 1. The “ecological” method of factor analysis utilized here results in factors bipolar in nature with high positive and negative loadings. To describe adequately such factors requires a label reflecting both these poles. So in what follows both poles will be identified, with the positive pole label first.

Factor 1. Eight items loaded above .40 on this factor, which accounted for 23.6% of the variance. The high positive loadings reflected the salience of personal intellectual achievements

such as being cultured and attaining academic success in contrast to the personal but non-intellectual values espoused by the highest negatively loading items about grooming and appearance. This factor was labeled “Being cultured versus Physical appearance”.

Factor 2. Eight items loaded .40 or above on this factor, which accounted for 19.1% of the variance. Four of these were positively loading items referring to the salience of family relationships, religious beliefs, and being law abiding and honest while the remaining four negatively loading items referred to being talented, personal goals, influence, and recognition. So this factor seemed to contrast the importance for the self of collectivist, family-oriented, moral values with more individualist achievement. This factor was labeled “Family values versus Personal success”.

Factor 3. Seven items loaded above .40 on this factor, which accounted for 12.1% of the variance. Four of these were positively loading items concerning intelligence, ability to earn money, personal recognition, and academic achievement while the three high negative loadings came from items referring to moral courage, family responsibilities, and religious beliefs. Thus this factor seemed to contrast the salience of personal ability with moral, group values. This factor was labeled “Intelligence versus Group morality”.

Factor 4. Five items loaded above .40 on this factor, which accounted for 10.3% of the variance. The three highest positively loading items referred to aspects of the social self such as being loving, friendly, and liked whereas by far the highest negative loadings came from an item on physical abilities. This factor was labeled “Social relationships versus Physical abilities”.

TABLE 1

Loadings above .40 from Ecological Factor Analysis of Standardized Country Means of ASSEI Importance Ratings

<i>Factor I (23.6%)</i>		<i>Factor II (19.1%)</i>		<i>Factor III (12.1%)</i>		<i>Factor IV (10.3%)</i>	
Being cultured	.84	Family relationships	.80	Intelligence	.88	Being loving	.85
Academic achievement	.66	Being law abiding	.62	Earning money	.63	Being friendly	.66
Family responsibilities	.43	Being honest	.59	Personal recognition	.55	Being liked	.59
Physical abilities	-.42	Religious belief	.59	Academic achievement	.43	Being law abiding	-.47
Earning money	-.43	Personal recognition	-.47	Religious beliefs	-.43	Physical abilities	-.71
Personal goals	-.44	Personal influence	-.52	Family responsibilities	-.46		
Appearance	-.66	Personal goals	-.66	Moral courage	-.82		
Grooming	-.83	Being talented	-.76				

Three very similar factors were obtained by using the same factor analytic procedure with the ASSEI satisfaction ratings and in independent analyses of the ranks of the ASSEI importance and satisfaction ratings, but Factor 4 contrasted social relationships with religious beliefs rather than physical abilities in both analyses of the satisfaction data.

Country by Gender Differences

The factor scores of the 15 country by gender groups for the importance ratings are shown in Table 2.

Next we divided this data into two groups according to the cultural dimensions of Individualism/Collectivism (see Method)—see Table 3 for means—and conducted I/C \times Gender ANOVAs of these factor scores (see Table 4). It can be seen that no main gender effects were statistically significant for any of the factor scores but that main

effects for Individualism/Collectivism were found for the importance and satisfaction of Family vs. Personal Success and the importance of Intellectual vs. Physical Self and significant interaction effects were found for all but two Importance and Satisfaction factor scores (the importance of Intelligence vs. Group Morality and the satisfaction of Intellectual vs. Physical Self). Inspection of the relevant factor scores in Table 3 makes it clear that subjects from the collectivist countries were more likely to consider being intellectual or cultured rather than physical appearance as salient for self and that males from individualist countries considered appearance as well as personal success to be relatively important. However, it was the females from individualist countries who were much more likely to consider their interpersonal relationships to be salient (Factor 4) and who were the most satisfied with themselves in this respect. These females were also by far the most satisfied with their family rela-

TABLE 2
Factor Scores on 4 ASSEI Importance Factors for 15 Country Groups by Gender

<i>Being Cultured (+) vs. Physical Appearance (-)</i>	<i>Family Values (+) vs. Personal Success (-)</i>	<i>Intelligence (+) vs. Group Morality (-)</i>	<i>Social Relationships (+) vs. Physical Abilities (-)</i>				
Nepal F	2.48	Ethopia F	1.54	Nigeria M	2.56	USA F	1.58
Nepal M	1.79	Ethiopia M	1.33	South Africa (W) F	1.79	Canada F	1.21
India F	1.67	South Africa (B) M	1.32	Hong Kong M	1.56	Hong Kong F	1.16
China M	1.50	Zimbabwe F	1.01	Canada F	1.23	Australia F	.93
China F	1.32	South Africa (W) F	1.01	USA M	1.13	New Zealand F	.89
India M	1.25	Malaysia F	.89	Canada M	.64	South Africa (B) M	.86
Philippines F	.42	Malaysia M	.75	USA F	.58	Hong Kong M	.84
Ethiopia F	.18	Hong Kong F	.64	Hong Kong F	.57	Ethiopia M	.82
Ethiopia M	.14	Nepal M	.61	Ethiopia M	.50	USA M	.73
Philippines M	.11	South Africa (B) F	.55	Nepal F	.45	India M	.50
Malaysia M	.10	Nigeria F	.53	Zimbabwe F	.41	South Africa (B) F	.45
South Africa (B) F	.07	Nigeria M	.43	Nigeria F	.35	Zimbabwe F	.37
Hong Kong F	.01	Australia F	.24	Nepal M	-.06	India F	.32
Hong Kong M	.01	Zimbabwe M	.18	Ethiopia F	-.09	Nepal M	.30
Malaysia F	-.12	South Africa (W) M	.11	China F	-.09	South Africa (W) F	.26
Canada F	-.16	Philippines F	.08	Philippines F	-.23	Australia M	.03
USA F	-.28	Nepal F	-.09	Malaysia F	-.25	Nepal F	-.09
USA M	-.37	Hong Kong M	-.12	Zimbabwe M	-.30	Ethiopia F	-.16
Zimbabwe M	-.37	New Zealand F	-.24	China M	-.36	Canada M	-.21
South Africa (W) F	-.39	China F	-.31	Malaysia M	-.59	China F	-.23
Nigeria M	-.41	USA F	-.33	Philippines M	-.62	South Africa (W) M	-.23
Australia F	-.54	India M	-.34	India F	-.64	China M	-.36
Zimbabwe F	-.77	Philippines M	-.44	South Africa (B) M	-.66	Malaysia M	-.40
South Africa (W) M	-.79	India F	-.53	Australia F	-.67	Malaysia F	-.49
Canada M	-.80	Australia M	-.68	New Zealand F	-.86	New Zealand M	-.50
New Zealand F	-.86	China M	-.71	India M	-.88	Zimbabwe M	-.66
Australia M	-.89	Canada F	-.83	South Africa (B) F	-.92	Nigeria F	-1.05
New Zealand M	-1.08	New Zealand M	-1.50	New Zealand M	-.97	Philippines M	-1.87
South Africa (B) M	-1.26	USA M	-2.24	Australia M	-1.60	Nigeria M	-2.38
Nigeria F	-1.98	Canada M	-2.87	South Africa (W) M	-1.99	Philippines F	-2.62

M = male; F = female; B = black; W = white.

TABLE 3
Means of Culture Means for Combined Individualist (N = 5) and Collectivist (N = 10)
Cultures by Gender for Importance and Satisfaction Factor Scores

	<i>Individualist</i>		<i>Collectivist</i>	
	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>
<i>Importance</i>				
Being cultured (+) vs. Physical appearance (-)	-.79	-.45	.29	.33
Family values (+) vs. Personal success (-)	-1.44	-.03	.30	.43
Intelligence (+) vs. Group morality (-)	-.56	.42	.12	-.04
Social relationships (+) vs. Physical abilities (-)	-.04	.97	-.24	-.23
<i>Satisfaction</i>				
Being cultured (+) vs. Physical appearance (-)	.06	.40	-.13	-.10
Family values (+) vs. Personal success (-)	-.21	-1.05	.30	.34
Intelligence (+) vs. Group morality (-)	.99	-.46	.06	.21
Social relationships (+) vs. Religion (-)	.22	.79	-.26	-.24

TABLE 4
Summary F Statistics from Individualism/Collectivism (I/C) × Gender Analyses of Variance of Importance and
Satisfaction Factor Scores

	<i>Factor Scores</i>			
	<i>Intellectual (+) vs. Physical Appearance (-)</i>	<i>Family Values (+) vs. Personal Success (-)</i>	<i>Intelligence (+) vs. Group Morality (-)</i>	<i>Social Relationships^a (+) vs. Physical Abilities (-)</i>
<i>Importance</i>				
I/C	6.42*	13.24*	0.74	3.70
Gender	0.17	3.80	0.35	0.97
I/C × Gender	6.76*	21.46*	2.53	6.57*
<i>Satisfaction</i>				
I/C	0.76	7.35*	1.22	4.10
Gender	0.13	0.60	2.97	0.33
I/C × Gender	1.03	9.54*	7.48*	4.98*

^a Social relationships (+) vs. Religion (-) for Satisfaction ratings.

* Statistic is significant at .01 level.

tionships rather than their personal success while it was their male peers who were much more satisfied than the other groups with their intelligence.

Correlates with Cultural Data

The correlations between the importance and satisfaction factor scores for each of the 15 cultural groups, averaged for males and females, and indices (where available) for Hofstede's (1983) four cultural dimensions, the Chinese Cultural Connection's (1987) Confucian Work Dynamism value and 1993 Gross National Product (GNP; Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1993) are shown in Table 5.

It can be seen that only 5 of the 48 correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level. This is not surprising given the low sample sizes involved (10 to 15 countries) and the consequent

large magnitude of the correlation coefficient needed for statistical significance. What is surprising, perhaps, is that three of those significant correlations were with the economic indicator, GNP. The higher the GNP of a country the more likely the subjects sampled here were to consider their personal success rather than the quality of their family life to be salient for their self-esteem. In addition, higher GNP was associated with the importance and satisfaction with social relationships rather than the physical self. None of the correlations between any of the factor scores with the cultural dimensions of Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity/Femininity, or Confucian Work Dynamism were statistically significant. However, salience of the physical rather than the social self was found to be related to greater Power Distance, whereas greater Collectivism correlated significantly with quality of family life rather than personal success.

TABLE 5

Correlates of Importance and Satisfaction Factor Scores with Cultural Dimensions and Gross National Product (GNP)

	<i>GNP</i>	<i>Power Distance</i>	<i>Uncertainty Avoidance</i>	<i>Individualism/ Collectivism</i>	<i>Masculinity/ Femininity</i>	<i>Confucian Value</i>
<i>Importance</i>						
Being cultured (+) vs. Physical appearance (-)	-.38	.45	-.54	-.18	.07	.66
Family values (+) vs. Personal success (-)	-.74*	.56	.02	-.77*	-.50	.13
Intelligence (+) vs. Group morality (-)	.22	.06	-.03	-.15	-.33	-.01
Social relationships (+) vs. Physical abilities (-)	.52*	-.58*	-.23	.41	.08	.38
<i>Satisfaction</i>						
Being cultured (+) vs. Physical appearance (-)	.30	-.55	-.23	.36	.32	.39
Family values (+) vs. Personal success (-)	-.38	.50	-.06	-.29	-.51	.34
Intelligence (+) vs. Group morality (-)	.43	-.05	.14	.15	.13	-.47
Social relationships (+) vs. Religious (-)	.66*	-.52	-.17	.51	.23	.08

* Significant at .05 level.

CONCLUSIONS

This "ecological" level research, based on the responses of 3604 social science students from 15 countries (with Black and White South African data treated separately) and on analyses of both standardized raw scores and rank order data, supports other recent research that questions the validity of claims about cultural dimension and gender differences in the nature of self-concept.

As predicted from the literature, respondents from the collectivist countries placed greater salience on "family values" as a component of their self-concept than did those from the individualist countries. Unexpectedly, however, this was not true of "social relationships". This once again questions the homogeneity of the concept of collectivism (Bond, 1994; Schwartz, 1994). This finding is consistent with that of Kashima et al. (1995) that the salience of social relationships does not differentiate between individuals from supposedly individualist and collectivist countries. The gender differences predicted by Josephs et al. (1992) were confirmed only for the Western, individualist countries where the females valued "family values" and "social relationships" more than did their male peers. For the 10 collectivist cultures no such gender differences were evident (contrary to the findings of Kashima et al.). Of course, one must always treat an instrument such as ASSEI, which was initially developed in one

culture, with caution in cross-cultural research, even when pilot validity studies are attempted. Thus it was important that those findings were consistent with those based on analysis of TST responses reported by Watkins, Adair, et al. (1996), which also indicated that there is a strong interaction effect between gender and the Individualism-Collectivism cultural dimension regarding the nature of self-esteem. This also emphasises the need for analysis of *gender* in future country level studies. Of course research with a wider range of individualist countries (rather than the five largely Anglophone countries studied here) may well show differences within such countries, as found in this research and by Watkins, Adair, et al. (1996) within collectivist countries. Also a major weakness of research in this area is the over-reliance on university student samples, as in this and most other similar studies. The assumption that findings with such samples can be generalized to other citizens of these countries is a dubious one at best. In future research we hope to use multiple discriminant analysis to analyze ASSEI responses from a wider sampling of countries (including non-college subjects of different ages) and then to relate the findings to other culture level data such as those on values by Schwartz (1994) and P.B. Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) and on the importance of psychological characteristics (Williams et al., 1995). Also worthy of future research is the at

least superficially apparent contrast of these findings with those of Williams and Best (1990), that in more collectivist cultures the relative rigidity of sex roles is higher.

Manuscript first received March 1997

Revised manuscript accepted August 1997

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Bond, M.H. (1994). Into the heart of collectivism: A personal and scientific journey. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bond, M.H., & Cheung, T.-S. (1983). College students' spontaneous self-concept: The effect of culture among respondents in Hong Kong, Japan, and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14*, 153–171.
- Brislin, R.W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W.J. Lonner & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (pp. 137–164). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Byrne, B. (1996). *Measuring self-concept across the life span*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Byrne, B., Shavelson, R.J., & Marsh, H.W. (1992). Multigroup comparisons in self-concept research. In T.M. Brinthaupt & R.P. Lipka (Eds.), *The self: Definitional and methodological issues*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Cattell, R.B. (1966). The scree test for number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioural Research, 1*, 245–276.
- Chinese Cultural Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 143–164.
- Clark, B., & Trow, M. (1960). *Determinants of college student subculture*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
- Cousins, S.D. (1989). Culture and self-perception in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 124–131.
- Davis-Zinner, N. (1990). *Source differences in male and female self-esteem*. Unpublished PhD thesis, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.
- Dhawan, N., Roseman, I.J., Naidu, R.K., Thapa, K., & Rettek, S.I. (1995). Self-concepts across two cultures; India and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26*, 606–621.
- Elovson, A.C., & Fleming, J.S. (1989). *Rationale for multidimensional self-esteem scale scoring and weighting*. Unpublished manuscript, California State University.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica (1993). *Britannica world data annual*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.
- Enriquez, V. (1993). Developing a Filipino psychology. In U. Kim & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Indigenous psychologies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fleming, J.S., & Courtney, B.E. (1984). The dimensionality of self-esteem: II. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 404–421.
- Harter, S. (1985). Competence as a dimension of self-evaluation: Towards a comprehensive model of self-worth. In R.L. Leavy (Ed.), *The development of the self*. Orlando, FL: Academic.
- Hattie, J. (1992). *Self-concept*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions. In J.B. Deregowski, S. Dziurawiec, & R.C. Annis (Eds.), *Explinations in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 335–355). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Hsu, F.L.K. (1985). The self in cross-cultural perspective. In A.J. Marsella, G. de Vos, & F.L.K. Hsu (Eds.), *Culture and self*. London: Tavistock.
- Inelmen, K. (1996). *Relationship of sex-role orientation to two measures of self-esteem*. Unpublished MA thesis, Bogazici University.
- Ip, G.W.M., & Bond, M.H. (1995). Culture, values and the spontaneous self-concept. *Asian Journal of Psychology, 1*, 29–35.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of psychology*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.
- Josephs, R.A., Markus, H.R., & Tafarodi, R.W. (1992). Gender and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 391–402.
- Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S.C., Gelfand, M.J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 925–937.
- Kuhn, M.H., & McPartland, T.S. (1954). An empirical investigation of self-attitudes. *American Sociological Review, 19*, 68–76.
- Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224–253.
- Marsh, H.W. (1988). *The Self-Description Questionnaire 1: SDQ manual and research monograph*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- Mpofu, E. (1994). Exploring the self-concept in an African culture. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 155*, 341–354.
- Pelham, B.W., & Swann, W.B. (1989). From self-conceptions to self-worth. On the sources and structure of global self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 672–680.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schwartz, S. (1994). Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U.

- Kim, H.C., Triandis, C., Kagitcibasi, S.C., Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schweder, R.A., & Bourne, E.J. (1982). Does the concept of self vary cross-culturally? In A.J. Marsella & G.M. White (Eds.), *Cultural conceptions of mental health and therapy*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.
- Shavelson, R.J., Hubner, J.J., & Stanton, G.C. (1976). Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46, 407-441.
- Smith, I.D. (1978). Sex differences in self-concept revisited. *Australian Psychologist*, 13, 161-166.
- Smith, P.B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 231-264.
- Sunar, D., Inelmen, K., Israel, E., Karabaty, S., Karamolla, N., & Uner, S. (1995). *Self-esteem and its sources in two Turkish samples*. Paper presented at the European Congress of Psychology, Athens, Greece.
- Tam, A.S.F., & Watkins, D. (1995). Towards a hierarchical model of self-concept for Hong Kong Chinese adults with physical disabilities. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30, 1-17.
- Triandis, H.C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.
- Triandis, H.C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C.H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1006-1020.
- Watkins, D. (1978). The development and evaluation of self-esteem measuring instruments. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 42, 171-182.
- Watkins, D., Adair, J., Akande, A., Gerony, A., McInerney, D., Sunar, D., Watson, S., Wen, Q., & Wondimu, H. (1996). *Individualism-collectivism, gender, and the self-concept: A nine-culture investigation*. Paper presented at the XIIIth Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Montreal, August 12-16.
- Watkins, D., Yau, J., Dahlin, B., & Wondimu, H. (1997). The twenty statements test: Some measurement issues. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 28, 626-633.
- Watkins, D., Yau, J., Fleming, J., Davis-Zinner, N., Tam, A., Juhasz, A., & Walker, A. (1996). *Gender differences in the basis and level of adult self-esteem: A cross-cultural perspective*. Paper presented at the XIIIth Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Montreal, August 12-16.
- Watkins, D., & Yu, J. (1993). Gender differences in the source and level of self-esteem of Chinese college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 347-352.
- Williams, J.E., & Best, D.L. (1990). *Sex and psyche*. London: Sage.
- Williams, J.E., Saiz, J.L., Duval, D., Munick, M.L., Fogle, E.E., Adom, A., Haque, A., Neto, F., & Yu, J. (1995). Cross-cultural variation in the importance of psychological characteristics: A seven-country study. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30, 529-550.
- Wylie, R.C. (1989). *The measurement of self-concept*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Yamaguchi, S. (1994). Collectivism among the Japanese: A perspective from the self. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX 1
Means of Importance Ratings by Culture and Gender of Western Countries

	<i>Australia</i>		<i>Canada</i>		<i>New Zealand</i>		<i>South Africa (W)</i>		<i>USA</i>	
	<i>Male (N = 34)</i>	<i>Female (N = 170)</i>	<i>Male (N = 67)</i>	<i>Female (N = 139)</i>	<i>Male (N = 43)</i>	<i>Female (N = 108)</i>	<i>Male (N = 74)</i>	<i>Female (N = 105)</i>	<i>Male (N = 201)</i>	<i>Female (N = 192)</i>
Looks	6.06	6.78	7.48	7.80	6.67	6.72	7.32	7.63	7.82	7.94
Physical abilities	6.78	7.01	7.99	7.27	7.33	6.34	8.39	7.60	8.11	7.41
Grooming	6.69	7.98	7.79	8.12	6.67	7.51	7.13	7.42	8.10	8.25
Being liked	6.86	7.83	7.67	8.01	6.98	7.38	7.39	7.38	7.79	7.79
Being friendly	7.94	8.81	8.21	9.08	7.49	8.24	8.56	8.05	8.64	9.09
Being loving	7.19	8.34	7.75	8.44	6.91	7.88	8.22	7.87	8.63	8.88
Being law abiding	6.64	7.96	6.82	7.92	6.65	6.81	7.58	7.75	6.78	7.66
Being honest	8.31	8.81	7.72	8.65	8.14	8.26	8.53	8.39	8.12	8.83
Being courageous	7.97	8.06	7.75	7.63	7.86	7.78	8.06	7.48	7.63	8.26
Family relationship	7.58	8.64	7.78	8.58	7.44	8.31	8.35	8.38	8.50	8.94
Family responsibilities	7.47	8.40	7.50	8.24	7.16	7.64	8.28	7.86	8.38	8.63
Intelligence	6.44	7.34	7.91	8.43	6.81	6.69	7.01	7.94	8.24	8.32
Academic achievement	6.31	7.22	7.52	8.09	6.05	6.45	7.35	7.61	8.08	8.32
Being cultured	5.06	6.78	6.92	7.11	5.93	6.19	7.42	7.31	7.34	7.54
Talented	6.67	6.64	7.68	7.58	6.26	6.40	7.10	7.33	8.14	7.33
Earning money	4.47	5.35	6.48	6.20	4.67	4.41	6.68	7.31	7.25	6.67
Personal recognition	6.22	7.44	7.86	8.20	7.05	6.73	7.41	7.90	8.33	8.26
Personal goals	7.72	8.44	8.68	8.82	8.28	8.22	8.12	7.79	8.84	9.08
Personal influence	6.56	6.62	7.05	6.89	6.47	6.03	7.41	6.53	7.75	7.49
Religious beliefs	6.11	6.66	5.62	6.09	4.70	5.78	8.10	6.99	6.72	7.04

APPENDIX 2
Means of Satisfaction Ratings by Culture and Gender of Western Countries

	<i>Australia</i>		<i>Canada</i>		<i>New Zealand</i>		<i>South Africa (W)</i>		<i>USA</i>	
	<i>Male (N = 34)</i>	<i>Female (N = 170)</i>	<i>Male (N = 67)</i>	<i>Female (N = 139)</i>	<i>Male (N = 43)</i>	<i>Female (N = 108)</i>	<i>Male (N = 74)</i>	<i>Female (N = 105)</i>	<i>Male (N = 201)</i>	<i>Female (N = 192)</i>
Looks	6.24	5.43	7.48	7.80	6.40	5.70	6.31	5.21	6.96	6.75
Physical abilities	6.47	5.39	7.99	7.27	6.05	5.42	6.07	5.06	6.78	6.25
Grooming	7.15	6.69	7.79	8.12	6.88	6.54	5.60	4.98	7.40	7.45
Being liked	7.15	7.09	7.67	8.01	6.88	6.88	5.59	5.14	7.35	7.62
Being friendly	7.74	7.95	8.21	9.08	7.51	7.60	6.12	5.38	8.02	8.66
Being loving	6.65	7.25	7.75	8.44	6.98	7.19	5.58	5.55	6.57	7.62
Being law abiding	7.59	8.42	6.82	7.92	6.98	7.78	5.65	5.59	7.18	8.12
Being honest	8.18	8.48	7.72	8.65	7.74	8.00	6.00	5.68	7.86	8.39
Being courageous	7.47	7.06	7.75	7.63	7.30	6.98	5.97	5.26	6.59	7.04
Family relationship	7.03	7.74	7.78	8.58	7.53	7.25	6.25	5.49	7.80	7.88
Family responsibilities	6.97	7.66	7.50	8.24	6.65	7.04	5.99	5.18	7.48	7.88
Intelligence	6.91	6.89	7.91	8.43	6.44	6.27	5.60	5.14	7.15	7.01
Academic achievement	7.26	7.49	7.52	8.09	5.88	6.31	5.28	5.21	6.85	7.26
Being cultured	6.26	6.29	6.92	7.11	6.44	6.27	5.21	4.54	6.62	6.38
Talented	6.88	5.98	5.79	7.58	6.12	5.79	5.04	4.73	6.97	6.37
Earning money	5.73	6.24	6.48	6.20	5.70	5.94	4.83	4.43	6.01	6.31
Personal recognition	6.12	6.48	7.86	8.20	5.83	6.01	5.21	4.71	6.54	6.55
Personal goals	6.59	6.71	8.68	8.82	6.53	6.34	5.39	5.37	6.40	6.63
Personal influence	6.50	6.42	7.05	6.89	6.07	5.98	5.41	4.76	6.70	6.76
Religious beliefs	6.12	7.08	5.62	6.09	6.53	6.62	7.01	5.71	6.45	6.89

APPENDIX 3

Means of Importance Ratings of ASSEI Items by Culture and Gender for Collectivist Cultures

	<i>China</i>		<i>Ethiopia</i>		<i>Filipino</i>		<i>Hong Kong</i>		<i>India</i>	
	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 90)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 99)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 147)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 18)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 48)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 116)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 175)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 183)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 110)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 105)
Looks	6.03	6.31	6.88	6.11	6.98	7.11	6.37	6.49	5.45	5.28
Physical abilities	7.48	7.52	7.13	6.89	8.47	8.94	7.25	6.99	6.60	6.85
Grooming	6.68	6.07	6.67	6.39	7.86	8.26	6.44	6.86	4.85	5.73
Being liked	7.74	7.82	8.06	7.61	7.45	7.22	7.09	7.53	8.22	8.49
Being friendly	8.76	8.59	8.32	7.67	8.78	8.50	7.85	7.95	8.94	8.90
Being loving	8.19	8.06	7.97	7.56	7.80	7.77	7.43	7.52	7.94	7.67
Being law abiding	8.33	8.26	7.90	7.61	8.57	8.85	7.10	7.26	7.87	7.72
Being honest	9.30	8.71	8.87	9.39	8.80	8.95	7.79	8.04	8.98	8.78
Being courageous	7.73	7.30	7.05	6.94	8.02	8.27	6.63	7.03	8.68	8.70
Family relationship	9.39	8.90	8.79	9.28	8.57	9.30	7.48	7.99	8.82	8.98
Family responsibilities	9.12	8.92	8.37	9.00	8.14	8.93	7.37	7.61	8.80	9.05
Intelligence	7.67	7.42	7.46	7.39	8.00	8.30	7.47	7.26	6.83	7.08
Academic achievement	7.72	7.49	7.39	7.33	8.02	8.42	7.22	7.26	7.51	7.97
Being cultured	8.37	8.23	6.95	6.22	7.62	8.14	6.17	6.41	7.45	7.41
Talented	7.56	7.64	6.03	5.50	7.94	8.07	6.48	5.97	6.74	7.34
Earning money	4.89	5.42	6.00	4.56	6.24	6.29	6.32	5.86	4.43	5.43
Personal recognition	8.17	7.98	7.72	5.94	7.47	7.47	7.31	7.32	6.82	7.43
Personal goals	8.89	8.90	8.00	7.78	8.57	8.66	7.45	7.59	8.41	8.31
Personal influence	6.66	7.18	5.84	5.17	7.02	6.60	5.99	6.54	6.55	7.00
Religious beliefs	7.04	7.75	7.73	7.50	8.78	8.60	5.98	6.54	6.98	7.40

	<i>Malaysia</i>		<i>Nepal</i>		<i>Nigeria</i>		<i>South Africa (Black)</i>		<i>Zimbabwe</i>	
	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 75)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 185)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 205)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 177)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 71)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 122)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 46)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 124)	<i>Male</i> (<i>N</i> = 147)	<i>Female</i> (<i>N</i> = 138)
Looks	6.96	6.90	6.39	4.89	7.41	6.95	8.07	7.40	8.26	8.15
Physical abilities	7.72	8.09	7.36	6.37	7.89	8.28	8.17	8.10	8.49	8.25
Grooming	7.43	8.26	5.97	4.58	7.84	8.26	8.53	7.78	8.04	8.18
Being liked	7.31	7.18	7.60	6.66	7.36	7.68	8.20	7.94	8.24	8.20
Being friendly	8.48	8.73	8.66	8.53	7.91	8.22	9.07	9.01	8.64	8.83
Being loving	8.31	8.59	8.14	7.68	7.52	7.77	8.91	8.92	8.34	8.66
Being law abiding	8.05	8.21	8.06	8.06	8.05	7.92	8.51	8.16	8.44	8.26
Being honest	8.53	8.90	9.05	8.65	8.07	8.31	8.93	9.10	8.52	8.85
Being courageous	8.01	8.22	7.95	6.84	7.11	7.48	8.63	8.65	7.89	7.71
Family relationship	8.99	9.31	8.90	9.07	8.26	8.53	8.93	9.24	9.15	9.27
Family responsibilities	8.64	9.01	8.47	8.47	7.54	7.95	8.58	9.10	8.96	9.15
Intelligence	7.89	8.15	7.32	7.07	8.14	7.91	8.11	8.16	8.38	8.46
Academic achievement	7.71	8.13	8.36	8.14	7.64	7.34	8.13	8.22	7.87	8.25
Being cultured	7.27	7.46	7.70	7.97	7.32	6.25	7.76	7.89	7.96	7.00
Talented	6.48	6.28	7.12	6.58	7.49	6.85	7.57	7.52	7.74	6.83
Earning money	5.73	5.97	5.43	3.26	7.62	7.65	7.39	6.89	6.22	6.41
Personal recognition	7.47	7.82	6.85	7.14	7.67	7.24	7.59	7.70	7.25	7.66
Personal goals	8.13	8.49	7.02	6.52	7.74	8.26	8.30	8.86	8.49	8.78
Personal influence	7.21	6.86	7.14	7.00	7.48	6.92	7.26	7.89	7.26	6.69
Religious beliefs	9.11	9.25	7.29	7.01	7.14	7.03	8.02	8.23	7.22	7.99

APPENDIX 4

Means of Self-satisfaction Ratings of ASSEI Items by Culture and Gender for Collectivist Cultures

	<i>China</i>		<i>Ethiopia</i>		<i>Filipino</i>		<i>Hong Kong</i>		<i>India</i>	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
	(<i>N</i> = 90)	(<i>N</i> = 99)	(<i>N</i> = 147)	(<i>N</i> = 18)	(<i>N</i> = 48)	(<i>N</i> = 116)	(<i>N</i> = 175)	(<i>N</i> = 183)	(<i>N</i> = 110)	(<i>N</i> = 105)
Looks	6.08	5.66	7.07	5.94	7.61	7.11	5.61	5.66	6.17	5.95
Physical abilities	6.55	5.86	6.81	6.28	7.34	8.94	5.62	5.87	6.63	6.53
Grooming	6.00	5.97	6.61	6.28	7.69	8.26	5.89	6.15	5.50	6.04
Being liked	6.37	5.80	7.53	7.06	7.29	7.22	6.09	6.40	7.63	8.12
Being friendly	7.52	7.56	8.03	7.67	8.10	8.50	7.13	7.15	8.11	8.46
Being loving	7.58	7.36	7.60	6.78	6.71	7.77	5.96	6.48	7.98	7.31
Being law abiding	8.63	8.71	7.15	7.67	7.76	8.85	7.21	6.90	7.65	7.41
Being honest	8.64	8.90	8.36	8.72	7.94	8.95	7.59	7.45	8.67	8.47
Being courageous	7.01	6.67	6.66	7.59	7.18	8.27	5.95	6.00	8.50	8.51
Family relationship	8.63	8.94	8.42	9.11	7.90	9.30	6.33	6.85	8.80	8.78
Family responsibilities	8.56	8.89	7.60	8.39	7.57	8.93	6.03	6.52	8.08	8.99
Intelligence	7.05	6.58	6.80	6.29	6.47	8.30	6.22	5.76	6.36	6.69
Academic achievement	6.88	7.54	6.42	6.76	6.53	8.42	6.33	5.96	7.19	7.56
Being cultured	6.42	5.54	5.95	5.37	6.18	8.14	5.31	5.10	7.23	6.95
Talented	5.72	4.49	4.90	4.44	6.73	8.07	5.34	4.66	6.48	6.43
Earning money	4.30	3.66	4.78	5.82	6.22	6.29	4.56	4.85	4.65	5.00
Personal recognition	6.21	5.21	6.62	6.33	6.65	7.47	5.66	5.83	6.71	6.80
Personal goals	7.11	6.23	6.97	6.28	6.43	8.66	5.56	5.78	7.92	7.59
Personal influence	6.28	5.19	5.27	4.78	6.63	6.60	5.32	5.67	6.78	6.65
Religious beliefs	7.57	6.47	7.13	8.50	7.98	8.60	5.69	5.49	7.15	7.23

	<i>Malaysia</i>		<i>Nepal</i>		<i>Nigeria</i>		<i>South Africa (Black)</i>		<i>Zimbabwe</i>	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
	(<i>N</i> = 75)	(<i>N</i> = 185)	(<i>N</i> = 205)	(<i>N</i> = 177)	(<i>N</i> = 71)	(<i>N</i> = 122)	(<i>N</i> = 46)	(<i>N</i> = 124)	(<i>N</i> = 147)	(<i>N</i> = 138)
Looks	7.61	7.02	6.63	5.25	7.22	6.98	2.76	2.02	8.63	7.99
Physical abilities	7.16	6.89	7.13	6.09	7.35	7.28	2.93	2.15	8.04	7.68
Grooming	7.64	7.54	6.66	5.40	7.13	7.53	3.41	2.31	7.84	7.70
Being liked	6.79	6.57	7.49	6.58	7.15	7.10	3.28	2.74	7.70	7.79
Being friendly	7.55	7.58	8.09	8.05	7.27	7.64	3.57	2.76	8.18	8.31
Being loving	7.59	7.62	7.68	7.47	7.11	6.97	3.87	2.86	7.99	8.05
Being law abiding	7.80	7.71	7.60	7.49	7.32	7.60	4.14	2.88	8.50	8.09
Being honest	8.07	7.97	8.29	8.18	7.33	7.88	4.22	3.02	8.29	8.35
Being courageous	7.52	6.90	7.54	7.66	6.62	6.66	4.30	2.67	7.76	6.69
Family relationship	8.19	8.23	8.37	8.55	7.49	7.86	4.50	3.05	8.91	8.84
Family responsibilities	7.93	7.62	7.82	8.00	6.77	7.49	3.96	3.01	8.67	8.48
Intelligence	7.07	6.67	6.93	6.90	7.19	7.06	3.87	2.90	8.17	7.59
Academic achievement	7.00	6.80	7.54	7.10	6.44	6.57	3.72	2.67	7.03	6.86
Being cultured	6.39	5.82	7.26	6.98	5.89	5.41	4.09	2.86	7.56	6.21
Talented	5.84	5.36	6.82	6.52	6.01	5.90	3.59	2.90	7.03	5.88
Earning money	5.45	5.28	5.55	4.48	6.09	6.08	3.54	2.48	5.43	5.26
Personal recognition	6.67	6.53	6.72	7.19	6.49	6.44	3.41	2.62	6.92	7.07
Personal goals	6.87	6.88	6.91	6.83	6.64	7.15	3.73	3.09	7.24	7.92
Personal influence	6.67	6.10	7.10	7.08	6.45	6.09	4.09	3.48	7.03	6.70
Religious beliefs	8.12	8.03	7.13	7.01	7.01	6.57	4.80	5.12	7.03	7.43