Self-Esteem in Context of Individualistic and Collectivistic Orientations

Anurakti Chaturvedi
Post-Doctoral Fellow,
Deptt. of Psychology,
Lucknow University,
Lucknow

Abstract
When individuals construct social realities about the world, as the subject matter deviates from biological and physiological phenomenon, more the culture intrudes in shaping of the theories that people construct. The truth in the studies generally reflects one's "own culture". Therefore, understanding the cultural context is important to appreciate and understand the behaviors and activities of people. Culture have been studied and compared on many dimensions, of them Collectivism-Individualism is the most quoted, extensively researched in Cross-Cultural Psychology. It has been found that Asian cultures generally put greater emphasis on collectivism and western world typically promotes individualism. Hence development of self and self-esteem will differ in collectivist and individualist cultural orientations. Since gender roles are defined differently in all cultures, self-esteem of males and females is also compared.

Keywords: Self-Esteem, Colletivist, Individualist, Self, Indian, Culture, Cross- Cultural, Comparative.

Introduction
Culture

Every human society has its own particular culture or socio-cultural system and it is embedded in person's way of life. An individual's attitudes, values, ideals and beliefs are greatly influenced by the culture in which he or she lives. There is two-fold impact on human behavior in changing or mixing cultures in which both individuals and culture influence one another respectively. Firstly, people from different cultural backgrounds will influence one another. Secondly, one strong culture will dominate another culture. There are a number of diversification, similarities and commonness in the culture all over the world. Because of changes in a culture a person both adopts and adapts the characteristic of the new culture whatsoever he enjoins. It is one's own cultural background and heritage with its merits and limitations that make people of one culture different from another culture. This is why persons from different culture have different identities, different values, different personalities and different physical and mental health. Cultures have many dimensions, but one of the comprehensively researched dimensions is individualism-collectivism.

N. Hasnain
Professor,
Deptt. of Psychology,
Jamia Millia Islamia,
New Delhi

Individualism-Collectivism

Many studies demonstrate the utility of Individualism-Collectivism **(IC)** to explain cultural differences in behavior. Anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists alike have used this dimension to explain differences between cultures (Hofsteade, 1980; Kluckholn and Strodtback, 1961; Mead, 1961; Triandis, 1972). Individualism – Collectivism refers to the degree to which a culture encourages, fosters, and facilitates the needs, wishes, desires, and values of an autonomous and unique self over those of a group. In individualistic cultures, personal needs and goals take precedence over the needs of others. In collectivistic culture, individual needs are sacrificed to satisfy the group.

People in every culture have both collectivist and individualist tendencies, and although none of them can be separated into entirely two different entities but the relative emphasis is towards individualism in the West and towards collectivism in the East and South. In collectivistic cultures, there is great concern about what happens in the in-group and to in-group members. This is also true in individualist cultures, but the in-group in that case is narrow, consisting only of first degree relatives and a few "best friends", and there is more emotional detachment from the larger in-group. Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai and Lucca (1989)

P. C. Mishra
Professor,
Deptt. of Psychology,
Lucknow University,
Lucknow

Periodic Research

arrived at a number of defining attributes of the construct. First, collectivists pay much more attention to some identifiable in-group and behave differently towards members of that group than they do towards out-groups. An in-group is a natural group (i.e. family, friends, co-workers, neighbors, fellow countrymen) that provides individuals with a sense of identity. In different countries, the in-group can be different. For example, in most cultures, the family is the main in group, but in some other cultures, other in-groups such as the tribe or the country can be just as important. The work group is as important in-groups in some countries (e.g. Japan) that have achieved stunning economic success in recent times.

In collectivists behavior is regulated largely by in-group norms and emphasizes hierarchy. Usually the father is the boss and women subordinate to men. This is not nearly as much the case among individualists. In collectivist cultures, in-group goals have primacy over individual goals. In individualist cultures, personal goals have primacy over in-group goals. People from collectivist culture often interpret the behavior of people from individualist cultures as 'selfish'.

In-group fate, in-group achievement, and interdependence within the in-group are emphasized by collectivists. Personal fate, personal achievement, and independence from the in-group are emphasized by individualists. But self-reliance has a different meaning in these two kinds of cultures in the collectivist cultures it means "I am not a burden on the in-group", in individualist cultures, it means "I can do my own thing".

The self is defined as an appendage of the in-group in collectivist cultures and a separate and distinct entity in individualistic cultures. The individual decides which group to pay attention to, "picks and chooses" in-groups, and forms new in-groups when that is convenient. Certain values Such as pleasure and competition are emphasized by individualists more than by collectivists, whereas family integrity, security, obedience, and conformity are valued more by collectivists.

Culture and Concepts of Self

In Individualist way, the self is seen as a bounded entity consisting of a number of internal attributes in navigating his or her thought and actions in different social situations. A noted anthropologist, Clifford Geertz(1975), observed two decades ago that self is seen as, "a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic center of awareness, emotion, judgement and action organized into a distinctive whole and set constructively both against other such wholes and against a social and natural background." Here, people routinely credit their success to trusting their instincts, self-confidence and the ability to make decisions and stick by them. There is a strong belief in separateness of an individual. The normative task in these cultures is to maintain the independence of the individual as a separate entity, know his/her rights, assert him/her self when needed, actualize inner self

and develop strong self-esteem to achieve personal goals.

What people actually mean and understand as the self is dramatically different in some cultures. But, we only see these differences in the clashes that occur when people with different sense of self interact with each-other. These divergent forms of self are tied to differences in what people notice and think about, how they feel and what motivates them (Markus and Kitayama, 1991).

A fundamentally different view of self is collectivistic concept where the self is composite self, in which an individual is viewed as inherently connected or interdependent with others and inseparable from social context. In **Indian context**, external attribution and feedback dominate the way the sense of self is formed. Individuals in these cultures are socialized to adjust to an attendant relationship or a group to which they belong, to read each-other's minds, to be sympathetic and to occupy and play their assigned roles to engage in appropriate actions. Individuals strive to meet duties, obligations and social responsibilities. The most salient aspect of conscious experience is inter-subjective, one rooted in, finely tuned interpersonal relationships. This is indicated by overlapping of self with relevant others. This flexible and context specific approach self often leads to poorer self-esteem in individuals in collectivist cultures than their individually oriented counterparts. Of course, considerable variation on independent and interdependent construals of self and self-esteem also occur within a single culture (Gilligan, 1982; Markus and Tafarodi, 1992). These intra-cultural differences are also important when considering cultural differences and construct of self-esteem.

Thus, we can conclude that people living in individualist cultures have very well developed sense of self, leading to better scores on measures of self-esteem in comparison to people living in collectivist cultures.

Determinants of Individualism-Collectivism

Homogeneous cultures tend to be collectivist. In homogeneous cultures people can have large areas of agreement concerning what behaviors are expected under what conditions. Norms of behavior are clear, and imposed with great certainty. People are quite concerned about acting correctly and very sensitive to what the group expects. Success is often attributed to the help of others, and failures to one's own lack of effort. In contrast, in individualistic cultures behavior reflects attitudes. People often attribute success to their own intelligence, while failure is seen as the result of the difficulty of the task or bad luck, express their dissonant views very clearly, and that make the collectivist feel that they are out-group members. The individualists often are much less concerned about what others think and do.

When the goals of the in-group and the individual are in conflict (e.g. old parents try to interfere with one's career), the collectivist finds it natural to use the in-group goals, and the individualist to use the personal goals. The values stressed by

Periodic Research

collectivists are security, obedience, duty, in-group harmony, hierarchy, and personalized relationships. The values stressed by individualists are winning the competition, achievement, freedom, autonomy, and fair exchange.

When choosing a mate, collectivists think about "a good job", "chastity," "loyalty" and "togetherness" while individualists think of an "exciting personality," "physical attraction," and the "fun we have together". Individualism is good for creativity; collectivism is good in other ways. Each has much to learn from the other.

The above discussion shows that culture is for us as water is for fish. However, the values, beliefs, rituals and space of freedom provided by culture place immense influence on individual's personality and behavior. These aspects differ in terms of individualist and collectivist emphasis given by the particular culture, and they in turn influence and reflect in the behavior of individuals. Keeping these ends in view the present research work was planned and carried out.

Self – Esteem

Self esteem is a socio-psychological construct that assesses an individual's attitudes and perceptions of self-worth. Webster's Dictionary (2006) says that self-esteem is "satisfaction with oneself". Self-esteem refers to the worth or dignity that one ascribes to one self. In German, the word 'selbswertgefuhl' make this clear. It is a feeling of worth that we have of ourselves. The word "esteem" derived from the Latin word 'aestimare', denotes an estimation that I make of my own value.

Self-esteem is a widely used concept both in popular language and in psychology. It refers to an individual's sense of his or her value or worth, or the extent to which a person values, approves of, appreciates, prizes, or likes him or herself (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). The most broad and frequently cited definition of self-esteem within psychology is Rosenberg's (1965), who described it as a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the self and the most quoted formula for understanding **self-esteem=success/ aspiration.** It has been defined by Lowe (1961), 'as one's attitude towards self', and by Panderson (1965) as "an organized configuration of perceptions, BELIFS, feelings, attitudes and values which the individual views as a part of characteristics of oneself". The identification of one's self or the attainment of a self-concept begins early in life and is surely one of the most important concept that an individual ever forms. Awareness of self is surely central to all acts of self-control.

The Basic Behavioral Science Task Force of the National Advisory Mental Health Council (2004) offers a fuller explanation: "Self esteem begins to develop early in life and has been studied in children as young as seven years old of age. As children learn to describe aspects of themselves, such as their physical attributes, abilities and preferences, they also begin to evaluate them. Researchers conclude that contrary to intuition individuals have not one but several views of their selves, encompassing many domains of life, such as scholastic ability, physical appearance and romantic appeal, job competence, and adequacy as provider".

The ultimate expression of the development of a living system is to maintain its special and temporal integrity and to maintain itself against the flux of the environment likely more than anything else. The self concept contributes to this maintenance and gives continuity to our experience throughout our waking hours. The person with a highly integrated and stable self-concept may be less dominated than others by external events. The self-concept must surely be one of the most automated of all concepts because it begins early in the life and is shaped continually throughout life.

Lewin (1948) proposed that the self-concept might be a complex schema consisting of many integrated sub-systems. These sub system are sub concepts that are related to different spheres of one's life but are never the less affected by momentary condition of the whole self-system. Examples of such sub concepts are one's physical appearance, one's social role, and one's intellectual ability. Thus if a person has a poor opinion of himself, or a poorly integrated self concept, his postural schema may be affected along with the entire self concept. Self-esteem is generally considered to be the evaluative component of the self- concept, a broader representation of the self that includes cognitive and behavioral aspects as well as evaluative or affective ones (Blascovich and Tomaka, 1991). While the construct is most often used to refer to a global sense of self-worth, narrower concepts such as self-confidence or body-esteem are used to imply a sense of self-esteem in more specific domains. It is also widely assumed that self-esteem functions as a trait, which means it is stable across time within individuals. Self-esteem is an extremely popular construct within psychology, and has been related to virtually every other psychological concept or domain, including personality (e.g. shyness), behavioral (e.g. task performance), cognitive (e.g. attributional bias), and clinical concepts (e.g., anxiety and depression). While some researchers have been particularly concerned with understanding the nuances of the self-esteem construct, others have focused on the adaptive and self- protective functions of self-esteem (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991).

Healthy self-esteem means liking yourself, for the most part, as you are. It is crucial for determining how they will approach life and interact with others. People are motivated to have high self-esteem, and having it indicates positive self-regard, not egotism. It is one of the components of self-concept. Besides self-esteem, self-efficacy or mastery, and self-identities are the important parts of the self-concept. Self-esteem is generally a stable characteristic of adults. So it is not easily manipulated as an outcome in experimental designs. It is unrealistic to think that self-esteem can be "taught" rather it is developed through an individual's life experiences.

Periodic Research

Self-esteem is the emotional aspect of self and generally refers to how we feel about or how we value ourselves. It is often affected by how well or poorly a person performs, particularly in comparison to others. Self-esteem represents an individual's need to belong and feel loved unconditionally; it is not just a happy positive idea about oneself, but rather a reflection of one's character and self-respect.

Self-esteem has many aspects and develops within the context of a child's evolving sense of identity and the ever-changing life tasks and challenges he/she faces. It is a lifelong process whose roots are established in early childhood. A child's sense of identity is developed through his or her view of acceptance, power, control, competence and moral virtues. It is the sense of being worth and the confidence to face the world, has to be nurtured with positive reinforcement from significant adults in the child's life-mainly the parents. Many researchers agree that parental nurturance, support and participation have a positive effect on self-esteem. It stands for pride. Self-esteem involves both self-relevant beliefs and associated self-relevant emotions. It also finds expression in behavior.

Individual assessments of self-esteem are formed through two interrelated processes. First, individuals compare their social identities, opinions, and abilities with others. To the extent that individuals feel that they are inferior to those with whom they interact, their self-esteem will be negatively affected. Second, individuals assess themselves through their interaction with others. People learn to see themselves as others believe them to be. If significant others do not think highly of an individual, that individual will come to think poorly of himself or herself. This is referred to as the "reflected appraisal" of one's self-worth (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1978).

One area in which self-esteem appears to exert especially powerful effects is with respect to people's reactions to self-relevant feedback or information (Jones, 1973). High self esteem people accept only positive consistent information, whereas low self esteem people accept and are affected by both positive and negative information (Campbell and Fairey, 1985). Self esteem differences in subsequent expectations and performance within the success and failure conditions, self esteem differences were negligible in the conditions of success, but under failure conditions, low self esteem subjects exhibited substantially lower expectations and performance than did high self esteem subjects. More importantly, explaining a hypothetical success increased the expectations and performance of both low self-esteem and high self-esteem subjects, whereas explaining a hypothetical failure decreased the expectations and performance of only low self-esteem subjects. Thus we can say that high self esteem people exhibit:

1. More extremity and self-reported confidence when rating themselves,
2. More temporal stability in their trait ratings after a certain time interval,
3. More congruence between their self-concepts and their situation- specific behaviors, and More

internal consistency and increased self rated confidence than low self esteem subjects.

Bushman and Baumeister (1998) found that people with high self-esteem are egoists, and seem to know more about themselves and their preferences. A person with high self-esteem is more likely to view an insecure work situation as challenging than as threatening and therefore avoid experiencing job insecurity. Brockner (1988) has advanced a hypothesis that persons with low self-esteem are generally more susceptible to environmental and, in particular, organizational events than are persons with high self-esteem.

Types of self-esteem

Psychologists generally split the self-esteem into two types: **earned and global** self-esteem (Covington, 1989). Earned self-esteem is the self-esteem that people earn through their own accomplishments-satisfaction from having scored well on an examination, for example. Barbara Lerner (1985) says that earned self-esteem is based on success in meeting the tests of reality measuring up to standards at home and in school.

Nathuniel (1994) Identified Three Specific Types of Self-esteem

G**lobal** self-esteem (resulting from a general evaluation), **specific** self-esteem (related to a situation or role such as work) and **task specific** self-esteem (related to competence in particular activity).
Implicit self-esteem refers to a person's disposition to evaluate oneself positively or negatively in a spontaneous, automatic, or unconscious manner. It contrasts with **explicit** self-esteem, which entails more conscious and reflective self-evaluation. Both explicit self-esteem and implicit self – esteem are subtypes of self-esteem proper.

The strongest and most convincing general formulations of the antecedents of self-esteem were expressed by James (1890) and Mead (1934). James (1890) in 'Principles of Psychology' concluded that human aspirations and values have an essential role in determining whether one regards oneself favorably. According to him, one's achievements are measured against his/her aspirations for any given area of behavior. If achievement approaches or meets aspirations in a valued area, the result is high self-esteem, if there is wide divergence we regard ourselves poorly. James views the self as "the sum total of all the material possessions, family members, his reputation and work." If they wax and prosper, he feels 'triumphant', if they dwindle and die away, he feels 'cast down'.

Myers (1963) asserts that the self develops in social interactions, and that significant others, such as parents, play a role in this process. Behaviors of significant others are perceived by the child as symbols of his/her worth. Rogers (1980) argues that permissive atmosphere which permits free expression of ideas and does not resort to harsh or frequent evaluative comparisons, enables the individual to know and accept himself. Conflicts can be averted if parents and significant others accept the views and values of the child, although, they need not

necessarily agree with him. Self-esteem and good relationships determined life satisfaction in the Kwan *et al.* study (1997). However, self-esteem was found to be more important in the individualist cultures and agreeableness was more important in the collectivists cultures.

In most of the East Asian cultures members constantly tone down their individuality by avoiding overly self-promoting and self-assertive self-presentations. The central motives of the self in these cultures, accordingly, are quite different from those of the North Americans who are encouraged, if not obliged to discover and assert their distinct positive inner qualities (Fiske, Markus and Nisbett, 1998; Markus and Kitayama 1991).

Self enhancement and self-consistency are two motives of the self that hold prominent positions in Western psychology (Jones 1973; Sedikides and Strube 1997; Swann et.al. 1987). In this light, it is not surprising that high self-esteem and self-congruence have been long regarded as quintessential markers of mental health in the West (Allport 1961; Lecky 1945; Maslow 1954; Rogers 1965). Self-esteem and self-congruence, respectively, represent the crystallized fulfillment of the need of self-enhancement and self-consistency. A growing number of cross-cultural psychologists, however, find that the motive of self-enhancement (Kashima and Triandis, 1986; Kitayama et.al. 1997; Heine *et.al.*, 1999) as well as the motive of self-consistency (Bachnik, 1992; Heine and Lehman, 1997; Kashima *et.al.*,1992; Rosenberger 1989) are weaker in East Asian than in Western cultures. In line with this cultural difference, recent findings further suggest that both self-esteem and level of identity consistency are less powerful predictors of well-being in collectivist than in individualist cultures.

Rationale of the Study

The above review of researches indicates that self-esteem is a complex phenomenon which influences, and in turn is influenced by many variables. Culture, class and economic level have no exceptions, rather, they are more important than other variables and provide root to nurture the self-esteem of individuals. Individualist and Collectivist orientations of culture with their specific attributes will provide different chances and opportunities for the nurturance of the self-esteem of their members. The description of dimensions of culture, asserts culture as the main construal of self and self-esteem, when directly linked with self will be differently construed by male and female members of individualist and collectivist oriented cultures.

As the present study has been conducted in India only, the focus will largely remain on Indian culture and related context only. A number of scholars (Bond, 1988; Sinha and Verma, 1987; Triandis, 1994; Triandis & Bhawuk, 1998) labeled Indian culture as collectivist. But, not all people in the Indian collectivist culture are collectivists. Triandis (1995) maintained that the most of the people in a collectivist nation in many situations act in collectivistic ways. However, there may be some who behave in individualist way on majority of occasions and there may be a large number of people who behave in individualist at some occasions. To sum up the situation, within one culture (whether it may be collectivist or individualist) there is a possibility of positively skewed variations among people on collectivism-individualism dimension.

In other words, largely collectivist Indians may inject an individualist intention or behave in individualist way if a situation so demands. Indians, as a culture, perceive a situation and they respond to it as an episode in an ongoing flow of interacting events and corresponding responses to them over a period of time (Sinha and Kanungo, 1997 and Sinha *et al.*, 2001, 2002). This long drawn interactive framework often leads Indians to think of a situation and the consequences of a response to it in terms of their individual interests as well as the pressure of social norms. More specifically, Indians examine a situation in all its complexities and try to trade off between their personal interests as well as the pressure of social norms. In the situations where the balance between the two can not be established, they are likely to behave in one fashion and cherish an intention of different kind. This is precisely the reason that Indians, learn to live with cognitive dissonance, unlike the people in west (Bharti, 1985). Sinha and Tripathi (1994) conceptualized collectivism as two separate dimensions and reported a study in which a sample of undergraduate students were found to predict behaving in both individualist and collectivist ways in seventeen out of twenty-three situations Sinha.

Sinha, Verma and Sinha (2001) and Sinha, Vohra, Singhal, Sinha and Ushashree (2002) examined the nature of situations and showed that Indians by and large are collectivists while interacting with family members and friends or behave as collectives. On the contrary, compelling personal needs and goals induce them to temper their collectivistic behavior by adding individualistic inclinations or intentions without being starkly individualists.

Apart from the nature of situations, the external environment might also affect the ways Indians construe and react to situations. Indians are getting increasingly exposed to the individualist cultural influences of the West through mass-media, exchange of visitors, import of western fashion, music, ideas and so on. Thus, one may expect an overall shift towards individualism, especially in Metro cities as the exposure and interaction is much more there in comparison to smaller cities and towns where the larger amount of population lives under the greater pressure to yield to social norms. Delhi, being the capital of India is a metropolitan city with hi-tech facilities available, people have no time for others. On the other hand in Eastern region of Uttar Pradesh particularly in Gorakhpur, people seem to strive more for the collective goals and social welfare. They are more concerned with family ties Social relations and community. It is, therefore, contended that there would be differences self-esteem in the inhabitants of collectivistic culture of Gorakhpur and individualistic

Periodic Research

culture of Delhi. Keeping these circumstances in view the present research work was planned and carried out.

Aim of Study

The objectives of the present study were to examine the difference between self-esteem of the students of individualist and collectivist cultures, male and female students, interactional effect of culture and gender on the self –esteem and to ascertain the difference between self-esteem of male and female **I.** students of individualist and collectivist culture.   **II.**

Hypothses

The hypotheses formulated for the study were that significant differences would be found between self-esteem of the students of individualist and collectivist cultures, male and female students, interactional effect of culture and gender on the self – esteem would be found significant and there would be difference between self-esteem of male and female students of individualist and collectivist culture.

Method

Participants   **III.**

A total of 400 participants with 200 males and 200 females were taken in the present study. Out **IV.** of which 100 males and 100 females were taken on incidental basis from various colleges of University of Delhi, New Delhi. Other 100 male and 100 female respondents were randomly selected from Gorakhpur. The age of subjects in all groups ranged from 20 to 24 years. All the subjects were graduates from any stream.

These subjects were administered Individualism-Collectivism Assessment Inventory (ICAI) of Matsumoto, Weissman, PETERSON, Brown and Kupperbush (1997). Total score of all subjects were found out. Q1 and Q3 were calculated to sort out the collectivist and the individualist respondents. Those obtaining Q1 and below were treated as individualists and those obtaining Q3 and above were treated as collectivists. Separate Q1 and Q3 were calculated for the males and females.

At the second stage of sampling, a total of 180 participants were sorted out for the study, on the basis of criteria of different groups of the study. Among them there were 90 participants of collectivist orientation (45 males and 45 females) and 90 subjects of individualist orientation (45 males and 45 females).

In the present study 2x2 factorial design was used wherein cultural orientation and gender were treated as Independent variables. Both the variables were taken at two levels, i.e. collectivist and individualist orientation in culture and males and females in gender and Self-esteem was treated as dependent variables.

Measures

Individualism-Collectivism Assessment Inventory (ICAI)

Individualism-Collectivism scale used in this study was developed by Matsumoto *et al.* (1997). It consists of 16 items. The items are described in general value terms (for example, obedience to authority, social responsibility, sacrifice, and loyalty)

rather than by specific statements tied to single actions. The 16 items are presented in relation to four social groups of interactions: (1) family, (2) friends, (3) colleagues and (4) strangers. The subjects were asked to rate the items on a 6 point scale. Increasing score indicates increasing collectivist orientation, therefore higher the score, more the subject is inclined towards collectivism. Lower score displays inclination towards individualism.

Self-Esteem Inventory

Self-esteem inventory developed by Coopersmith (1982) was used to measure the self-esteem of the subjects. The SEI is designed to measure the evaluative attitudes toward the self in social, academic, family and personal area of experience. The Adult form of the SEI was used in the study. This form consists of 25 items. The subject has to put a 'X' in the column of either 'LIKE ME' if he/she thinks the item signifies what he/she feels or 'UNLIKE ME', if he/she thinks the item does not signify what he/she feels.

Results

Table 1.1
Mean Self-Esteem Scores of Different Groups

Groups	Collectivists	Individualists	Mean of Means
Males	304.05	377.34	340.69
Females	304.85	370.83	337.84
Mean of Means	304.45	374.08	

Table 1.2
Results of ANOVA of self-esteem

Source	Sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cultural Orientation	218196.050	1	218196.050	64.599	<.01
Gender	366.939	1	366.939	.109	>.05
Cultural Orientation x Gender	601.339	1	601.339	.178	>.05
Error	594474.400	176	3377.697		
Total	21531297.0	180			

A look at the table1.1 shows clearly that Individaulists show a significantly high self-esteem than their Collectivistic counterparts across gender.
A perusal of Table 1.2 shows that F-ratio for cultural orientation was obtained to be 64.599 which was significant at .01 level of significance. This implies that culture influences self-esteem of participants to a very large extent.

The same table reveals that the F-ratio for gender was found to be 0.109 which was not significant at .05 level of significance. This means that males and females did not differ significantly on the self-esteem.

The same table depicts F-ratio for interaction of culture and gender which came as 0.178, non-significant at .05 level of confidence. Hence it is clear that culture and gender together do not influence the self-esteem of an individual. Although culture individually affects self-esteem in a significant way but the role of gender dissipates the results here.

Periodic Research

Table 1.3
Comparison of Self–esteem Score of Different Groups

Groups	Means	SD	T	Significance
Collectivist Males	304.05	53.51	0.064	>.05
Collectivist Female	304.08	65.17		
Individualist Males	377.33	54.20	0.546	>.05
Individualist Females	370.82	58.84		
Collectivist Males	304.05	53.51	6.455	<0.01
Individualist Males	377.33	54.20		
Collectivist Females	304.84	65.17	5.041	<0.01
Individualist Females	370.82	58.84		

Table 1.3 depicting *t- ratio* shows that both male and female individualists had significantly better self-esteem than their collectivist counterparts.

Discussion of Results of Self-Esteem

If we look at table 1.1 we shall see that mean self-esteem score of respondents of individualist culture was more than that of respondents of collectivist culture. Since F-ratio in the table 1.2 for culture came significant, it means that respondents from individualist culture had better self-esteem than respondents of collectivist culture. Thus, hypothesis 1 was proved true by the findings of the study.

The above findings support the findings of Realo (1999) who found that self-esteem was more important in individualist cultures, and agreeableness in collectivist cultures. This is because the individualist culture provides chances and opportunities to an individual to concentrate on his/her self-development based on personal internal experiences which provide the actual personal image, self-awareness, self-strengths and experiences. Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto and Norasakkunkit (1997) have also replicated these findings in their study and concluded that greater emphases are put on self-enhancement in United States and greater tendency of self-criticism in Japan.

Taylor and Wayment (1995) drew similar conclusions from their comparative study of high versus low self-esteem individuals. In individualist culture, an individual is more inclined towards personal gains than group gains and group welfare. Moreover Tafarodi and Swann (1996) suggested that individualist cultures promote the self-competence and self-esteem of an individual while collectivist culture promotes group-liking aspects. Suh *et al.* (1998) proposed that individualists' self-evaluations tend to be based chiefly on private experiences because the culture constantly directs the person's attention to unique, individuated aspects of his or her identity. All these aspects of individualist oriented culture lead to enhanced self-esteem of its members.

On the other hand, self-appraisal criteria in collectivist culture are social expectations, duties and obligations which form a 'Yoke' which inhibit personal and subjective image formation and satisfaction (Lu and Shih, 1997; Suh and Diener, 1999). Collectivists, base their self-judgments heavily on external referents and norms because the cultural mechanisms perpetually highlight the relational and interdependent aspects of the self. Thus, social obligation, expectation and duties etc. usurp the self-esteem of the members of collectivist culture.

So much so that, Diener and Diener (1995) found that in cultures where collectivity takes precedence over an individual, positive feeling about the self appear to constitute a smaller part of one's overall life's satisfaction. A comprehensive study done by Baucher, Peng, Shi and Wang(2009) shows that East Asians have low, inconsistent or dialectical self-esteem.

Markus and Kitayama (1991) suggested that the processes of self-concept formation may be same in both type of cultures but with different emphases. In a comparative study they found that people in collectivist societies tend to be higher on interdependent and lower on independent self-construal leading to low self-esteem, whereas the opposite relationship is expected in individualist cultures. Similar results were also obtained by Chi, Kim and Choi (1993).

Matsumoto (1999) is of the opinion that if one has to make meaningful cross-cultural comparisons in terms of self-construals, one must assume that a person from individualist society has a higher individual self-construal leading to better self-esteem in comparison to a person from collectivist culture who has a higher interdependent self-construal leading to low self-esteem.

Thus, we can conclude that collectivists work for the group and not for the personal gains and conformity and compliance to group norms is frequently displayed by them. They prefer to do things with others and their personal matters involve family and friends. They also believe that the group has the right to regulate their thinking and decisions thus leading to poorer self-concept and low levels of self-esteem. In contrast, individualists are associated with self-reliance and work towards the development of individual needs and interests. They strive for personal excellence and status and take responsibility of their own actions. They seem to find their sense of worth and value through self-realization of their potential thus leading to higher levels of self-esteem.

The same table 1.2 depicts that F-ratio for gender was found to be non-significant. Similarly, the F-ratio for the interactional effect of gender with culture was also found to be non-significant. Thus, hypotheses 2 and 3 were not proved true by the findings of the study.

Non-significant gender difference in self-esteem replicate the findings shown in table 1.2 that individuals belonging to same culture no matter whether they are males or females have similar self-esteem and gender did not have any significant impact on them. In the same way non-significant difference between mean self-esteem scores of males and females of collectivist, and males and females of individualist culture were found. All these findings affirm the view that gender of the individuals per se did not make any significant difference in their self-esteem. It is the cultural values, assumptions, freedom and boundaries which have powerful strength to influence the self-esteem of individuals. In the same way, results of table 1.3 affirm the same points where males of individualist and collectivist culture and females of individualist and collectivist

Periodic Research

culture were found to be significantly better in self esteem. In both cases both males and females of individualist oriented culture had better self-esteem than their counterparts of collectivist oriented culture. So, once again culture and not the gender of the individuals has emerged as the important construal in the formation of self-esteem of the individuals.

American culture champions self-respect while Asian cultures emphasize humility and self-criticism. Sure enough, Asians score low on self-esteem than Americans. Similar findings were replicated by Tsai, Ying and Lee (2001) where cultural orientation significantly predicted self-esteem, above and beyond the contribution of age, gender, grade point average, and socioeconomic status. These differences are consistent with the idea that cultural ideas about the self influence the self-esteem of individuals and not the gender. Overall, culture has stronger influence on self-esteem than of race, gender or income level. A recent cross- cultural study was done at a very large scale by Bleidorn, Arslan, Denissen, Rentfrow, Gebauer, Potter and Gosling (December, 2015). This study used a large Internet sample (N = 985,937) across 48 nations to provide the first large-scale systematic cross-cultural examination of gender and age differences in self-esteem. They found age-related increases in self-esteem from late adolescence to middle adulthood and significant gender gaps, with males consistently reporting higher self-esteem than females. Despite these broad cross-cultural similarities, the cultures differed significantly in the magnitude of gender, age, and Gender × Age effects on self-esteem.

Kwan, Bond and Singelis (1997) have pointed out in the review of related literature available, it is found that people living in different cultural contexts, either males or females tend to internalize and believe in existing models of self in their culture and by virtue of this internalizing of cultural idea of self, psychological systems show cross-culturally divergent characteristics. The cultural ethics form the core of the personality of an individual and not his gender (Kwan, Bond and Singelis, 1997).

Tafarodi, Shaughnessy, Yamaguchi and Murakoshi (2011) found that Japanese tend to report lower self-esteem than do Westerners. They concluded that the self-esteem ratings of Japanese and Canadians are shaped by contrasting performative pressures, we show that explicit instructions designed to offset these pressures predictably raise or lower reported self-esteem

Several notable attempts to measure self-construal at the level of gender and then to relate to the individual differences in self-esteem to differences in psychological functions in other domains were all grounded in the assumption that cultural views of the self are internalized by an individual to have significant influence on all of psychological processes.

The same assumption can hold true in context of social thinking and social behavior where males and females belonging to same culture behave in similar fashion irrespective of their gender (Dweck, 1993).A recent study done by Davis, Hicks, Schlegel,

Smith & Vess (2015) elaborated that authenticity would be a strong predictor of self-esteem levels when time was perceived as limited. Across studies, individuals who felt inauthentic reported lower levels of self-esteem when they perceived time as limited concluding that individualists will have higher self-esteem.

Therefore, we can conclude that individuals, of either gender, who live in one type of culture, have similar upbringing and self-formation leading to similarity in self-esteem. This is affirmed by the non-significant interactional effect of culture and gender, which suggests that culture alone is the sole construal, developer and patronizer of self and self-esteem of the individuals.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further researches can be carried out taking an account of various demographic variables, on rural and urban sample, across the sub-cultures, religion and language based sample from different districts and regions. The area included in the study should be widened for better results and generalizations.

References
1. Allport, G. (1961). *Pattern and Growth in Personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
2. Bachnik, J. (1992). The Two "faces" of self and society in Japan. *Ethos* 20: 3-32.
3. Barett, P.M.; Webster, H.M. and Wallis, J.R. (1999). Adolscent self-esteem and cognitive skills training: a school based intervention. *Journal of Child and Family Studies,* 8 (2), 217-227.
4. Baucher,H.C.; Peng,K.; Shi,J. and Wang, L(2009) Culture and Implicit Self-Esteem, Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology, Vol.40, no.124-145
5. Blascovich, J. and Tomaka, J. (1991). *Measures of Self-Esteem*. In J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.); *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*, Vol.1. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
6. Bleidorn, W., Arslan, R. C., Denissen, J. J. A., Rentfrow, P. J., Gebauer, J. E., Potter, J., & Gosling,S. D. (2015, December 21). Age and Gender Differences in Self-Esteem—A Cross-Cultural Window. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000078
7. Brockner, J. and Chen, Y. (1996). The moderating roles of self-esteem and self-contrual in reaction to a threat to the self: Evidence from the People's Republic of China and the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 603-15.
8. Choi, S.C., and Choi, S.H. (1993), We-ness : A Korean discourse of collectivism. In G. Yoon and S.C. Choi, (eds.), *Psychology of the Korean People : Collectivism and Individualism Seoul*, Korea : Dong-A, 57-84.
9. Covington, M. (1989). *Self Esteem and Failure in School*. Berkeley, CA; U.C. Press.
10. Cross, S.E. (1995). Self-construals, coping and stress in cross-cultural adaptation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 26, 673-679.

Periodic Research

11. Dalgas-Pelish, P. (2006). Effects of a self-esteem intervention program on school age children. *Pediatric Nursing* 32(4), 341-347.
12. Diener, E., and Diener, M. (1995) Cross-cultural correlates of the life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
13. Diener, E.; Diener, M.; and Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 851-64.
14. Fiske, A.P.; Kitayama, S.; Markus, H.R. and Nisbett, R.E. (1998). The cultural matrix of social psychology. In D. Gibert, S. Fiske, and G. Lindsey, (eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, pp. 915-981.
15. Funder, D.C. (1995). On the accuracy of personality judgement: A realistic approach. *Psychological Review*, 102, 652-670.
16. Geetz, C. (1984). "From the native's point of view": On the nature of anthropological understanding. In R.A. Shweder and R.A. Shweder and R.A. LcVine, (eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 123-36.
17. Greenberg, J. (2008). Understanding the vital human quest for self esteem. *Perspectives on Psychological Sciences*, 3, 48-55.
18. Heine, S.J. and Lehman, D.R. (1997). Culture, dissonance, and the need for positive sefl-regard. *Psychological Review,* 106: 766-94.
19. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International difference in work-related values*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
20. James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology*, Vol. 1, New York; Dover.
21. Jones. S.C. (1973) Self and interpersonal evaluations : Esteem theories versus consistency theories. *Psychological Bulletin,* 79: 185-99.
22. Kashima, Y., and Triandis, H.C. (1986). The self-serving bias in attributions as a coping strategy : A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology,*17: 83-97.
23. Kitayama, S.; Markus, H.R.; Matsumoto, H.; and Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: enhancement tendencies in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology,* 72: 1245-67.
24. Kwan, V.S.Y.; Bond, M.H. and Singelis, T.M. (1997). Pancultural explanations for life satisfaction: Adding relational harmony to self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 73: 1038-51.
25. Lecky, P. (1945). *Self-consistency: A Theory of Personality.* New York: Island.
26. Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving Social Problems.* New York: Harper.
27. Lowe, K.B. and Kroeck, K.G. (1996). Effective correlates of transformational and transactional leadership : A metaanalytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-426.
28. Lu, L., and Shih, J.B. (1997). Sources of happiness: A qualitative approach. *Journal of Social Psychology,* 137:181-87.
29. Markus, H.R., and Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation, *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
30. Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago press.
31. Mecca. Andrew., (1989). *The Social Importance of Self esteem*. Berkley, CA; U.C. Press.
32. Myers, David G. (1963). *Social psychology* (4th ed.). New York: Mc Graw Hill, Inc.
33. Myers, David, G. (1993). Cultural Influences. *Social Psychology* (IV Ed.), 187-188.
34. Nathuniel, Branden (1987). *How to Raise your Self Esteem.* New York, NY; Bantam books.
35. Romin W. Tafarodi, Sarah C. Shaughnessy,Susumu Yamaguchi, and Akiko Murakoshi (2011) The Reporting of Self-Esteem in Japan and Canada, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 42(1) 155–164,DOI: 10.1177/0022022110386373
36. Rosenberg, M., and Pearlin, L. 1. (1978). Social class and self-esteem among children and adults. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84, 53-77.
37. Rosenberger, N. (1989) Dialectric balance in the polar model of self: The Japan case. *Ethos*, 17, 88-113.
38. Sedikides, C. and Strube, M.J. (1997). Self-evaluation: To thine own self be good, to thine own self be sure, to thine own self be true, and to thine own self be better. In M.P. Zanna, (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 29, San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 209-269.
39. Sinha, D. and Tripathi, R.C. (1994). Individual in a collectivist culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim. H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.C. Choi & G. Yoon (Eds.). *Individualism and collectivism. Theory method and application* (123-136) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
40. Sinha, J.B.P. and Kanungo, R.N. (1997). Context sensitivity and balancing in organizational behaviour. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 93-105.
41. Sinha, J.B.P. and Verma, J. (1987). Structure of collectivism. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.) *Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 123-129). Lisse, The netherlands: Swets & Zetilinger.
42. Sinha, J.B.P.; Sinha, T.N. Verma, J. and Sinha, R.B.N. (2001). Collectivism coexisting with Individualism: An Indian Scenario. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 4, 133-145.
43. Sinha, J.B.P.; Vohra, N.; Singhal, S.; Sinha, R.B.N. and Ushashree, S. (2002). Normative predictions of collectivist-individualist intentions and behaviour of Indians. *International Journal of Psychology,* 37, 309-319.
44. Swann, W.B.; Gritin, J.J.; Predmore, S.C. and games, B. (1987). The cognitive affective crossfire: When self-consistency confronts self

Periodic Research

enhancement. Journal of *Personality and Social Psychology,* 52.881-89.

45. Tsai JL[1], Ying YW, Lee PA. Culture Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol. 2001 Aug;7(3):284-97. Cultural predictors of self-esteem: a study of Chinese American female and male young adults

46. 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.

47. Triandis, H.C. and Bhawank, D.P.S. (1997). Culture theory and the meaning of relatedness, In P. Christopher Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspective on international /organizational psychology* (pp. 13-52). San Francisco: The New Lexintong Press.

48. Triandis, H.C.; Bontempo, R.; Villareal M.J.; Asai, M. and Lucca, N. (1989). Individualism and Collectivism: Gross-cultural perspectives on self in group relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-338.

49. Webster, H.M.; Barett, P.M. and Wallis, J.R. (1999). Adolscent self-esteem and cognitive skills training: a school based intervention. *Journal of Child and Family Studies,* 8 (2), 217-227.

50. William E. Davis, Joshua A. Hicks, Rebecca J. Schlegel, Christina M. Smith & Matthew Vess (2015). Authenticity and self-esteem across temporal horizons,: Dedicated to furthering research and promoting good practice. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 10:2, 116-126, DOI: 10.1080/17439760.2014.910830