Interpersonal and Intergroup Bias in Japanese and Turkish University Students

R.A. Brown
Bunkyo University, Chigasaki, Japan

Mark S. Ferrara
Middle East Technical University Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

We attempted to measure the extent to which personal identification with a national (cultural, ethnic) in-group would affect interpersonal and intergroup biases. Two convenience samples of Japanese (N = 119) and Turkish (N = 66) university students served as participants. The Japanese students tended to describe themselves as "typical" Japanese and rated themselves significantly less positively with respect to 9 indigenous trait terms than they rated their national in-group, and they did not enhance their national in-group vis-à-vis a composite out-group comprising Chinese, Koreans, Americans, and Turks. The Turkish students tended to describe themselves as untypical of their national in-group and rated themselves significantly more positively with respect to 6 indigenous traits than they rated their national in-group. They rated their in-group significantly less positively than they rated a composite out-group comprising Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Americans. Implications for Social Identity Theory's self-esteem hypothesis are discussed.

Numerous studies have shown that North Americans self-enhance, while Japanese fail to, and on the contrary often self-efface (see Brown & Kobayashi, 2002; Heine, 2003; and Heine & Lehman 1997; Kobayashi & Brown, 2003; Kurman, 2001: Kurman, 2003; Muramoto, 2003; Takata, 2003 for reviews). If self-enhancement serves to maintain self-esteem (Taylor & Brown, 1988; 1994), then the Japanese failure to self-enhance would imply either that the Japanese do not need, or are unable to maintain, self-esteem, or that other psychological or emotional mechanisms may serve the same self-esteem maintaining purposes. If the former is the case, then the universality of a human need for positive self-esteem must be questioned. If the latter is the case, then self-esteem maintenance can not on its own account for self-enhancement. In this case, it remains to be explained how inaccurate and illusory self-perception can co-exist with good mental health and social functioning. It has also been suggested that individuals maintain their self-esteem (Hornsey, 2003), or more generally, their feelings of positive self-worth (Brown & Dutton, 1995) by incorporating elements of their group identities into their personal identities and self-evaluations (see Rubin & Hewstone, 1998 for a review). A positive group identity should contribute to a positive self-identity. A positive evaluation, at both individual and

group levels, can be accomplished either by exaggerating self and in-group merits or by derogating non-self in-group members and out-groups relative to the in-group. A number of factors are known to affect enhancing and derogating behavior, one of which is the extent to which an individual identifies with the group (Rubin & Hewtsone 1998, citing Oakes, Haslam, and Turner 1994). Of course, identification with a group can take many forms and can vary in degree. One can derive much or little of one's personal identity and self-evaluation from one or another of the groups one is a member of. One's identification with a group can vary over time and be sensitive to context. And the quality of the membership can vary as well—one can be variably accepted by members of the group itself, and variably recognized as belonging to the group by non-group members, both of which can have an impact on one's own self-assessments to the degree to which one is sensitive to the opinions, feelings, and behavior of other people.

There is very likely considerable variation in the extent to which people define themselves by group memberships, possibly driven by conflicting motives to be distinct, while being included (Brewer, 1991; Brewer & Pierce, 2005). We guessed that this might be expressed in the degree to which an individual describes oneself as a "typical" group member. We hypothesized that the magnitude of self-estimated "typicality" as a group member would moderate both self vs. in-group self-enhancement and effacement (which we will now refer to as "bias") and in-group vs. out-group bias. We tested this hypothesis on two convenience samples of university students, one from a country/ culture with comparatively well understood propensities for bias of the kind that we are describing, and another—Turkey—with comparatively not well understood propensities. We predicted specifically that personally self-effacing Japanese students would also be in-group effacing vis-à-vis out-groups, and that the degree to which they were self-effacing would be moderated by their self-professed membership in the in-group. Little is known about the relevant psychological characteristics of Turkish students. Like Japanese, they are members of a collectivistic culture (Hofstede, 1984), but unlike Japanese, they are Muslim. They are also, from the accounts of first hand observers, and from their own claims, highly nationalistic. We made no specific predictions but rather planned to use the Turkish results as an additional test of the hypothesis.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 66 Turkish (28 male, 38 female, average age = 20.9) and 119 Japanese (81 male, 38 female, average age = 18.8) university students, although different subsets of each sample participated in the three sub-studies. All students in both samples were enrolled in English language classes and cooperated voluntarily in exchange for bonus course credit. No student declined to cooperate, but several were excluded from analysis due to obvious response patterns (i.e., using the two extreme scales points exclusively) or incomplete data.

Instruments

We first assembled a list of trait words in each language by asking a subset of the students who would later participate in the main study simply to describe as succinctly as possible, preferably with a single word, various types of people, including themselves, other members of their own national group and several other nationalities. Approximately two weeks later, we asked the same students to assess the favorableness of the 50 most

commonly cited of those traits on a 7-point scale anchored by *very bad* (1) and *very good* (7). The midpoint of the scale (4) was explicitly labeled *neither good nor bad*. The questionnaire was designed in English and translated into Turkish and Japanese, and then back-translated to check for accuracy of meaning, following the procedures recommended by Behling & Law (2000). A small sample of traits was selected for use in the third instrument, based on considerations of familiarity to the samples and semantic overlap. The Japanese students rated themselves, other Japanese, and typical members of four out-groups (Koreans, Chinese, Americans, and Turks) on nine emic (indigenous) traits. Five were positive: *kinben* (hardworking), *teinei* (polite), *kashikoi* (clever) *majime* (serious), *shojiki* (honest), and four were negative: *jikochuushinteki* (selfish), *namakemono*, (lazy), *ishigayowaii* (weak-willed), and *shokyokuteki* (passive). The Turks rated themselves, other Turks, and typical members of four outgroups (Koreans, Chinese, Americans, and Japanese), on six emic (indigenous) traits. Four were positive: *konukserver* (hospitable), *caliskan* (hardworking), *durust* (honest), *akilli* (clever), and two were negative: *tembel* (lazy) and *bencil* (selfish). The standard demographic questions were included along with several other items designed to explore issues of in-group identification. Sample items were "The most important thing about me is that I am Japanese (Turkish)", and " I regret that I was born Turkish (Japanese)". As out-group targets, we selected countries (or rather, typical people from those countries), that we expected to be variably familiar to the students, at levels of economic, political, and social development both above and below that of the student's own country. This list is of course highly restricted and in some cases the target countries do not stand in the same political, historical, or cultural relations to the student's own. Due to a clerical error on the Turkish version of the questionnaire, several of the trait x target pairs were omitted. The questionnaire was readministered several weeks later with the missing traits and targets inserted. At this time, unfortunately, a number of the students were no longer available. This was partly offset by the reliability check that the second administration of the self and in-group ratings provided: None of the mean scores for any trait x target pair differed (at $p < .05$) over the two separate occasions of administration. We replaced the missing data with the series means. The resulting means were virtually identical before and after replacement.

The positive traits were aggregated, as were the negative traits, based on the favorableness ratings obtained previously. Finally, composite positivity scores for each target sample were calculated for each sample by subtracting the negative score from the positive score. The composite positivity scores were used for the main analyses. Interpersonal bias was defined as the difference between self-composite scores and in-group composite scores. Inter-group bias was defined as the difference between in-group composite scores and out-group-composite scores. (In the present research, there are four out-groups, hence four out-group composite scores). Finally, we aggregated the four out-group composite scores into a single grand composite out-group composite score.

Results

We first conducted single sample t-tests against the scale midpoint to confirm that the traits were evaluated as predicted, i.e., positive or negative, rather than the reverse or neutral. As expected, all of the trait words differed significantly ($p < .0001$) from the scale midpoint in the predicted direction. These trait ratings are shown in Table 1. We then conducted repeated measures ANOVAs to determine whether self, in-group, and composite out-group evaluations differed, followed by paired sample t-tests to ascertain where the differences lay.

Table 1.
Evaluations of Trait Words in Turkish and Japanese.

	M	*SD*
Japanese		
Shojiki (honest)	6.02 ****	1.15
Kashikoi (intelligent)	5.79 ****	1.21
Teinei (polite)	5.50 ****	1.12
Kinben (hard-working)	5.38 ****	1.34
Majime (serious)	5.15 ****	1.09
Shokyokuteki (passive)	2.73 ****	1.13
Ishigayowaii(weak-willed)	2.54 ****	1.04
Namakemono (lazy)	2.40 ****	1.13
Jishinchu (selfish)	2.34 ****	1.39
Turkish		
Durust (honest)	6.71 ****	0.74
Akilli (intelligent)	6.46 ****	1.19
Caliskan (hard-working)	6.21 ****	0.98
Konukserver (hospitable)	6.08 ****	0.85
Tembel (lazy)	2.08 ****	1.30
Bencil (selfish)	1.94 ****	1.32

Note. **** $p < .0001$.

For the Japanese raters, the three targets were evaluated quite differently (F (2,118) = 46.14, $p < .0001$) with the difference clearly being due to the low self ratings (for the in-group versus composite out-group comparison, t (119) = 1.00, $p = .32$). These results are shown in Table 2. Ratings for the four separate out-group countries are shown for reference). The mean difference between the interpersonal bias (self vs. in-group M = 5.23, SD = 8.16) and the inter-group bias (Japanese vs. composite out-group M = .52, SD = 5.68) differed significantly at $p < .0001$ (t (119) = 4.34). .

Table 2.
Japanese Composite Evaluations of Self, In-group, Composite Out-group, and Component Out-groups

	M	*SD*
Self	2.69	7.78
Japanese	7.98	5.41
Composite Out-group	8.49	3.66
Component Out-groups		
Turks	6.80	4.22
Koreans	9.90	5.63
Chinese	9.66	5.66
Americans	7.60	5.40

Table 3.
Turkish Composite Evaluations of Self, In-group, Composite Out-group, and Component Out-groups

	M	*SD*
Self	16.65	4.62
Turks	9.66	5.13
Composite Out-group	11.97	2.22
Component Out-groups		
Japanese	15.2	5.76
Koreans	12.0	4.14
Chinese	12.8	5.44
Americans	7.40	3.92

For the Turkish raters, the three targets were also evaluated quite differently (F (2,65) = 60.25, $p < .0001$) with self evaluations clearly more positive than in-group evaluations (Table 3). The in-group however was evaluated less positively than the composite out-group t (66) = 3.22, $p < .01$. The difference between the interpersonal (self vs. in-group M = 6.94 SD = 5.02) and inter-group (in-group vs. composite out-group M = -1.99, SD = 4.80) was substantial and significant (t (66) = 8.7, $p < .0001$).

Finally, we calculated an interpersonal/inter-group bias score by subtracting the difference between self and in-group ratings, from the difference between in-group and out-group ratings. We then calculated Pearson rs between our exploratory group identification measures (appendix items 9-18). These correlations are shown in Table 4.

Table 4.
Correlations Between Items 9-18 (appendix) and Interpersonal/intergroup Bias Scores

	Japanese	*Turks*
Item		
1	-.16	.42 ***
2	.31 **	.05
3	.00	-.16
4	.09	-.26 *
5	-.01	.33 **
6	.08	.34 **

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Four of the six items correlated at $p < .05$ or above in the Turkish sample. The four items seem to adequately capture the intended subjective sense of group identification and pride, and the correlations are in the expected direction. However, in the Japanese data only one item reached significance ($p < .01$) and it was not large. Since a single significant correlation seldom means anything important, we must conclude either that these items did not perform as intended for the Japanese sample or that Japanese tendencies to self-efface are not linearly related to pride in being Japanese or identification with Japanese as a group.

To determine whether the two student groups differed in the extent to which they endorsed items 1-6, we calculated both point biserial correlations (r_{pb}) using nationality as one of the independent variables and the individual items as the other, and Chi square tests on the responses treated categorically (as affirmative, negative, and neutral).[1] There were significant r_{pb}s between items 1 and 2 and nationality treated as an independent variable (both $r_{pb}s$ (185) = .31, $p < .0001$). Nationality and items 3 and 5 were significantly correlated at $p < .05$ or above, but the r_{pb} s were small. Items 4 and 6 did not reach the $p < .05$ level of significance. The results of the Chi square analyses were essentially identical to the point biserial correlations. The distribution of responses for items 1 and 2 differed at $p < .0001$ and $p < .001$($\chi 2$ (4, N = 185) = 20.15, and 16.43 respectively). The distribution of responses for items 3 differed at $p < .01$ ($\chi 2$ (4, N = 185) = 12.32) and item 5 differed at $p < .05$ ($\chi 2$ (4, N = 185) = 9.18). Items 4 and 6 did not reach the $p < .05$ level of significance. Apparently, the students did not differ much in how proud they are of their countries, or in how much they regret having been born where they were.

A majority of the Turks described themselves as untypical Turks (70%), denied that the most important thing about them is that they are Turkish (80%), and strongly affirmed the precedence of their individual identity over their ethnic identity (85%). The Japanese were less likely to describe themselves as untypical Japanese (35%) and less likely to disagree that their Japaneseness is the most important thing about them (50%) They were slightly less likely than the Turkish students to reject the notion that their individuality precedes their national identity (73%), although clearly a majority did reject it. The student samples did not differ in how much they regretted being born as members of their respective nationalities (only 21% of the Turks and 12% of the Japanese did not deny regretting being born into their respective ethnic group) or in how proud they were of

their ethnicity (Japanese 69% Turks vs. 59%).

Discussion

Clearly, this sample of Japanese students, like most Japanese samples reported in the literature, were not self-enhancing with regard to nine traits that they themselves had previously identified as being highly characteristic of either themselves or of Japanese. Nor did they indirectly self-enhance by enhancing their in-group. Equally clearly, this sample of Turkish students were, like most of the North American students described in the literature, self-enhancing, with respect to six traits that they themselves had previously identified as being highly characteristic of either themselves or of Turks. They were not however, in-group enhancing. It is not common for in-group evaluations to be less positive than out-group evaluations (although it does happen; McAndrew, et al 2000). In this case, however, it suggests that self-esteem is not being maintained by out-group derogation.

Implications for Self-Esteem Maintenance

Social Identity Theory (Tajfel 1981, Tajfel, 1982) posits that personal identity derives in part from group membership and that personal self-esteem derives from self-evaluations, and accordingly self-evaluations at least in part derive from group evaluations. But Japanese data have been problematic because Japanese do not appear to self-enhance (moreover, they report lower self-esteem by measures commonly used in North American research (Campbell et al, 1996; Heine & Lehman, 1997). If Japanese are collectivistic, as has been assumed since Hofstede (1984),[2] then are Japanese achieving their self-esteem maintenance goals by way of in-group enhancement? This does not seem to be the case. Rather it appears that whatever is motivating self-effacement is also motivating in-group effacement.

Modesty (Kurman & Sriram, 2002: Kurman, Yoshihara-Tanaka, & Elkoshi, 2003) and self-criticalness (Heine, Kitayama, & Lehman, 2001, among others) have been suggested as causes of Japanese self-effacement. If modesty is operating, one would expect to see positive self-evaluations that are *less* positive than in-group evaluations. If self-criticalness is operating, one would expect to see negative self-evaluations that are *more* negative than in-group evaluations. The present data suggest that both are operating, in that the students evaluated themselves both less positively (t (119) = -6.95, $p < .0001$), and more negatively (t (119) = 3.84, $p < .0001$) than they evaluated other Japanese. Their self-evaluations were not completely self-effacing however. They rated themselves as more honest (t (119) = 2.40, $p = < .05$) and less passive (t (119) = -5.24, $p < .0001$) than other Japanese. Nevertheless, with the exception of *ishigayowaii* (weak-willed), which was marginally significant ($p = .06$), evaluations on the other traits strongly favored the in-group. Other Japanese were evaluated as more hardworking, intelligent, polite, and serious, and less lazy (all at $p <. 0001$), and less selfish ($p < .01$).

The Turks, like the Japanese, members of a collectivistic culture[3] (Hofstede, 1984) also quite clearly were not maintaining self-esteem through in-group enhancement. Possibly their self-esteem was sufficiently maintained by impressive levels of self-enhancement displayed vis-à-vis the in-group. This suggests that a negative group evaluation is not incompatible with a positive self-evaluation. Certainly, it suggests that, whatever social identity contributes to personal identity, it is mediated by the degree to which the individual regards himself as being a “typical” member of that group.

In contrast to the Japanese tendencies, the Turkish students were non-modest and non-self-critical. Positive

self-evaluations were more positive (t (66) = 10.10, $p < .0001$) and negative evaluations were less negative (t (66) = -8.61, $p < .0001$) than in-group evaluations. Like the Japanese students, the Turkish students' self-evaluations vis-à-vis the in-group were not completely self-serving. Although they rated themselves more positively and less negatively overall (each self vs. in-group evaluation differed at $p < .0001$), they did evaluate other Turks more positively on one important quality, that of hospitableness ($p < .01$).

Limitations

It cannot be assumed that individuals evaluate out-groups on the basis of the same traits as they evaluate themselves and their in-groups. It also cannot be taken for granted that the valence of a trait will remain the same when applied to different targets. Nevertheless, because this was an exploratory study, we used a limited number of traits, although we took care to ensure that the traits used were familiar and emically meaningful to the raters. Obviously, future research should use a wider range of trait expressions.

We treated the valences of the traits dichotomously. But it is clear that trait valences are not simply positive or negative, but vary in how positive or how negative they are. It is conceivable that a rater could evaluate a target less favorably on several somewhat positive traits, but more favorably on one or a few very positive traits. In fact, an in-group could reserve for itself exclusive possession of a single trait, perhaps indefinable and entirely subjective, that is so overwhelmingly positive that it alone ensures that the in-group evaluation will be more positive than any out-group evaluation.[4]

We also limited the target out-groups in such a way that none were directly competitive for resources with the raters' in-group. In this way we hoped to avoid the confounding factors of resource competition. Using a composite out-group eliminates certain of the difficulties involved in using a real out-group, namely the real world existence of power and privilege differentials. But it introduces other problems—the valence of in-group vs. out-group comparisons will obviously depend on which out-group is serving as the target. As can be seen for example in Table 3, while the Turkish students evaluated Turks less positively than the three Asian out-groups, they evaluated them more positively than Americans.

The student samples were not entirely comparable. The Turkish students were on average 2.1 years older than the Japanese students and this age difference was statistically significant (t (180) = 15.48, $p < .0001$). Pearson rs were calculated between age and all of the other variables and no significant pattern of correlations emerged, although this may have been due to the small variance in the ages. The Turkish students tended to view themselves as untypical Turks and in reality, as students at an elite university in a country where relatively few people attend universities, they were statistically untypical (13.6% of the 18 year old population cohort were enrolled in universities in 1999, according to United States National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.). The Japanese students tended not to view themselves as untypical and in reality relatively many young Japanese do attend universities (39.7% of the 18 year old population cohort, in 2000, according to Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology, 2001)). As our primary purpose was not to directly compare the samples, this is not a major problem. Finally, as noted above, the six items that were intended to tap into in-group identity performed adequately for the Turks, but not for the Japanese. Degree of in-group identification is clearly of importance, yet no reliable measure seems to be presently available. In the past, researchers have assessed in-group identification and closely related constructs (such as degree of "ordinariness") simply by asking participants how strongly they identify with a specified reference group

(Brown & Williams, 1984) or how "ordinary" they believe they are with respect to a specified reference group (Ohashi & Yamaguchi, 2004). Although neither one addresses the precise issue of degree of in-group identification, in future research it might be wise to consider using something along the lines of the Luhtanen & Crocker Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luthanen & Crocker, 1992), or the Valk & Kara Ethinic Pride and Belonging subscale of the Ethnic Identity Scale (Valk & Karu, 2001).

References

Behling, O., & Law, K.S. (2000). *Translating questionnaires and other research instruments*. Quantitative applications in the social sciences No. 133. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personaility and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*, 475- 482.

Brewer, M. B., & Pierce, K. P. (2005). Social identity complexity and outgroup tolerance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 428-437.

Brown, J.D. & Dutton. K.A. (1995). The thrill of victory, the complexity of defeat: Self-esteem and people's emotional reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 712-722.

Brown, J.D. & Kobayashi, C. (2002). Self-enhancement in Japan and America. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 5*, 145-168.

Brown, R., & Williams, J. (1984). Group identification:The same thing to all people? *Human Relations, 37*, 547 -564.

Campbell, J.D., Trapnell, P. D., Heine, S.J., Katz, I.M., Lavalee, L.F., & Lehman, D.R. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Persionality and Social Psychology, 70*: 141-156.

Chen, C., Lee, S., & Stevenson, H.W. (1995). Response style and cross-cultural Comparisons of rating scales among East Asian and North American students. *Psychological Science, 6*, 170-175.

Heine, S. J. (2003). Self-enhancement in Japan? A reply to Brown & Kobayashi. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 75-84.

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, 73*, 1268-1283.

Heine, Kitayama, and Lehman (2001). Cultural differences in self-evaluation: Japanese readily accept negative self-relavent information. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32,* 434-443.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences* (abridged ed.). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Hornsey, M.J. (2003). Linking superiority bias in the interpersonal and intergroup domains. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 143*, 479-491.

Japanese Ministry of of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2001, July). *School Education Statistics*. Retrived January 8, 2004, from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/statist/index01.htm

Kurman, J. (2003). Why is self-enhancement low in certain collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 496-510.

Kurman, J. (2001). Self-enhancement: Is it restricted to individualistic cultures?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1705-1716.

Kurman, J., Yoshihara-Tanaka, C., & Elkoshi, T. (2003). Is self-enhancement negatively related to constructive self-criticism? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*, 24-37.

Kurman, J., & Sriram, N. (2002). Interrelationships among vertical and horizontal collectivism, modesty, and self-enhancement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*, 71-86.

Kobayashi, C., & Brown, J. (2003). Self-esteem and self-enhancement in Japan and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 567-580.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A copllective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 302-318.

Muramoto, Y. (2003). An indirect self-enhancement in relationship among Japanese. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 552-566.

Matsumoto, D. (1999). Culture and self: An empirical investigation of Markus and Kitayama's theory of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Asian Journal of Psychology, 2*, 289-310.

McAndrew, F.T., Akande, A., Bridgestock, R., Mealy, L., Gordon, S.C., Scheib, J.E., Akande-Atoun, B.E., Odewale, F., Nyahete, P., & Mubvakure, G. (2000). A multicultural study of stereotyping in English-speaking countries. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140*, 487-502.

Ohashi, M.M., & Yamaguchi, S. (2004). Super-ordinary bias in Japanese self-predictions of future life events. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7*, 169-186.

Reid, J. (1990). The dirty laundry of ESL survey research. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 323-338.

Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identiy theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2*, 40-62.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H (Ed.). (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takano, Y., & Osaka, E. (1999). An unsupported common view: Comparing Japan and the U.S. on individualism /collectivism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*:, 311-341.

Takata, T. (2003). Self-enhancement and self-criticism in Japanese culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 542-551.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J.D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin,103*, 193-210.

Taylor, S.E., & Brown, J.D. (1994). Positive illusions and well-being revisted: Separating fact from fantasy. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 21-27.

Triandis, H.C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U.Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

United States National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2002.* Retrived January 8, 2004, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/dt393.asp

Voronov, M., & Singer, J. A. (2002). The myth of individualism-collectivism: A critical review. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*, 461-480.

Valk, A., & Karu, K. (2001). Ethnic attitudes in relation to ethnic pride and ethnic differentiation. *The Journal of of Social Psychology, 141*, 583-601.

Appendix. Questionnaire items.

Turkish

1. Ben tipik bir Türk değilim.
2. Benim hakkımdaki en önemli şey Türk olmamdır.
3. Diğer ülkelerin Türkiye'den öğreneceği çok şey var.
4. Türk olmakla gurur duyuyorum.
5. Ben ilk olarak bireyim, sonra Türküm.
6. Türk olarak doğduğum için pişmanım.

Japanese

1. 私は典型的な日本人ではありません。
2. 私について一番大事なことは、日本人であるということです。
3. 他の国々は、日本から学ぶことがたくさんあります。
4. 私は日本人であることを誇りに思います。
5. 私は、まず私個人であって、日本人であることが次にきます。
6. 私は、日本人に生まれたことを残念に思います。

English Translation

1. I am an untypical _____ (Japanese/Turk).
2. The most important thing about me is that I am _____ (Japanese/Turkish).
3. Other countries have a lot to learn from _____ (Japan/Turkey).
4. I am proud to be _____ (Japanese/Turkish).
5. I am an individual first, _____ (Japanese/Turkish) second.
6. I regret that I was born _____ (Japanese/Turkish).

Authors' Note

Mark Ferrara is now at the Department of English, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, USA.

We are indebted to Yoko Kondo, Liangmei Bao, Ece Solak, Derya Dumlu, Ulas Karaca, and Erman Topcu, for assistance with various aspects of the research, and to Francis McAndrew for valuable comments on a previous version of this manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should by addressed to R.A. Brown, 1-2-22 East Heights # 103, Higashi Kaigan Kita, Chigasaki, Japan 253-0053. Electronic mail may be sent via internet to RABrown_05@hotmail.com.

Footnotes

1. We conducted both parametric and non-parametric tests to rule out response style effects, particularly with regard to the Japanese, who are known to be more conservative than non-Asian groups in their use of Likert type rating scales (Chen, Lee, & Stevenson, 1995; Reid, 1990). The actual pattern of responses, however, suggest that perhaps there are no great differences in response styles. Averaged over the six items 1-6, the present Japanese sample, for example, selected the scale midpoint significantly more often than the Turkish students did ($\chi 2$ (1, N = 1110) = 5.84, $p < .05$). But they also selected the extreme points of the scale more often than the Turkish students did ($\chi 2$ (1, N = 1110) = 4.06, $p < .05$). The differences, though statistically significant, were rather small—4% of the Turkish students selected one of the two extreme scale steps, while 5% of the Japanese students did.
2. However, Matsumoto (1999), Takano & Osaka (1999), and Voronov & Singer (2002) argue convincingly that Japanese are not necessarily more collectivistic than North Americans.
3. Obviously, the fact that Japan and Turkey are, or may be, collectivistic does not imply that the members of the student samples are also collectivistic. Moreover, collectivism (or allocentricism) can vary within a group (Triandis, 1994).
4. "Soul" in American black culture and "*Yamato damashii*" (Japanese spirit) in Japan are two such unique expressions. No doubt others exist in other cultural groups.