

The Cultural Construction of Self-Enhancement: An Examination of Group-Serving Biases

Steven J. Heine
Kyoto University

Darrin R. Lehman
University of British Columbia

Self-serving biases, found routinely in Western samples, have not been observed in Asian samples. Yet given the orientation toward individualism and collectivism in these 2 cultures, respectively, it is imperative to examine whether parallel differences emerge when the target of evaluation is the group. It may be that Asians show a group-serving bias parallel to the Western self-serving bias. In 2 studies, group-serving biases were compared across European Canadian, Asian Canadian, and Japanese students. Study 1 revealed that Japanese students evaluated a family member less positively than did both groups of Canadian students. Study 2 replicated this pattern with students' evaluations of their universities. The data suggest that cultural differences in enhancement biases are robust, generalizing to individuals' evaluations of their groups.

Research in cultural psychology has underscored the notion that many psychological processes are not universal and that culture plays an important role in influencing the ways that people think about, feel about, and view themselves. However, interpreting cultural differences obtained in psychological experiments is a nontrivial task. The favored interpretation of cultural psychologists is that the psychological process under study is shaped by the culture and hence varies across cultures (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991b; Shweder & Bourne, 1984). Competing with this cultural view is a more prosaic interpretation: that the methodology of the experiment is more meaningful and relevant to one of the cultures, thereby indicating superficial and misleading cultural differences (Berry, 1969; Hui & Triandis, 1985; Triandis, 1978). Given that many social psychological paradigms have emerged within Western, "individualistic" cultures, we may indeed have stacked the deck against finding comparable results when studying individual-based psychologi-

cal processes in Eastern, "collectivistic" cultures. Perhaps some failures to replicate common Western findings are attributable to the imposed etic of our individually based methodologies (Berry, 1969).

One way researchers can reduce the cultural bias in methodologies is to explore targets of evaluation that are more meaningful within Eastern cultures. In contrast to the individualistic view of self common in Western cultures, the view of self of Eastern cultures encompasses the important groups to which people belong (Markus & Kitayama, 1991b; Triandis, 1989). Using individuals' groups as targets is a significant step in moving beyond the limitations inherent in individual-centered methodologies.

Cultural Differences in Self-Enhancement

One domain of cross-cultural research that may be particularly susceptible to the potential imposed-etic effects of an individual-based methodology is self-enhancement. Self-enhancement research typically examines how individuals view themselves as individuals in unrealistically positive terms. The results of such research have revealed the various ways in which North Americans distort their views of themselves such that they appear, for example, overly competent and optimistic and more in control (for reviews, see Blaine & Crocker, 1993; Greenwald, 1980; S. E. Taylor & Brown, 1988). As is the case in the bulk of research on the self, self-enhancement research has emerged largely in the West.

Research in cross-cultural psychology and cultural psychology, however, has demonstrated that such unrealistically positive views of the self are not common in Eastern cultures, particularly in Japan. For example, Markus and Kitayama (1991a) found that Japanese do not demonstrate a false-uniqueness bias (i.e., the tendency to see oneself as uniquely talented or better than most people on a given dimension), although this effect has consistently been observed among North Americans (e.g., Campbell, 1986; Marks, 1984). Moreover, Japanese do not show this bias even when evaluating themselves on attributes they view as most important to succeeding in their culture (Heine &

Steven J. Heine, Department of Psychology, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan; Darrin R. Lehman, Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

This research was supported by a Japan Foundation Dissertation Fellowship and by Grants 410-93-1295 and 410-96-1600 from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Both studies reported here were included in Steven J. Heine's PhD dissertation, which was supervised by Darrin R. Lehman. We thank the other members of the PhD committee, Jennifer Campbell, John Pinel, and Jim Russell, for their valuable feedback, and David Mandel and Hisaya Matsumoto for their comments on a draft of this article. We are especially grateful to Lim Bon, Roger Buehler, Yumi Endo, Tsukasa Hashimoto, Cathy McFarland, and Katsuhiko Ohashi for their assistance in data collection. We would also like to thank Dawn Brandlmayr, Maho Harada, and Steven Race for their assistance in this research.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Steven J. Heine, who is now at the Department of Psychology, 3815 Walnut Street, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-6196 or Darrin R. Lehman, Department of Psychology, 2136 West Mall, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z4. Electronic mail may be sent via the Internet to heine@cattell.psych.upenn.edu or dlehman@cortex.psych.ubc.ca.

Lehman, 1997b). A number of studies have demonstrated that Japanese fail to show self-serving attributional biases (for a review, see Kitayama, Takagi, & Matsumoto, 1995), despite the marked tendencies of North Americans to attribute success to internal factors and failure to external factors (for a review, see Zuckerman, 1979). In contrast to the robust unrealistic optimism effects found with North Americans (e.g., Perloff & Fetzner, 1986; Weinstein, 1980), Japanese do not show much evidence for optimism biases and in some situations are actually unrealistically pessimistic (Heine & Lehman, 1995a). Furthermore, Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, and Norasakkunkit (1997) demonstrated that whereas Americans view everyday life in terms of opportunities for self-enhancement, Japanese view it in terms of opportunities for self-criticism. We know of no studies that have demonstrated consistent self-serving biases (SSBs) with Japanese or with people from Eastern cultures more generally.

Two Interpretations

One interpretation of these cultural differences in SSBs is that they reflect differences in motivations to view oneself as especially positive or competent (Heine & Lehman, 1995a, 1996; Heine, Lehman, Kitayama, & Markus, 1997; Kitayama, Markus, & Lieberman, 1995; Markus, Kitayama, & Heiman, 1997). Heine et al. (1997) have argued that these cultural differences in self-enhancement exist because Western (particularly North American) culture encourages people to think positively about themselves as a means to approach the culturally defined ideals of independence and autonomy. They have maintained that the construction of the typical North American's identity as a meaningful cultural entity hinges on the identification and confirmation of positive internal attributes of the self. The elaboration of positive self-attributes and the denial or neglect of negative attributes are thus rewarded in North America by a cultural validation of the individual. Hence, enhancing their self-assessments enables North Americans to maintain the subjective feeling of being authenticated by their culture (cf. Greenwald, 1980; Taylor & Brown, 1988).

In contrast, Eastern (particularly Japanese) culture encourages people to strive to fit in with their groups. The Japanese self is defined as a relational entity that is made meaningful in reference to the pertinent social relationships to which the self is a part (Hamaguchi, 1985; Markus & Kitayama, 1991b; Nakamura, 1964). Therefore, the construction of the typical Japanese individual's identity as a meaningful cultural entity involves the validation of the individual's social relationships by means of constantly seeking to identify and confirm shared expectations and norms. The identification of positive internal attributes of the self does not aid individuals in gaining a sense of belongingness. Possessing, let alone enhancing, a positive evaluation of the individual self ought not be a primary concern for Japanese. Hence, this cultural explanation argues that the very process of self-enhancement is not as meaningful to Japanese as it is to North Americans.

A very different interpretation of the cultural differences in self-enhancement is that they result from a methodological artifact. Given that cross-cultural studies of self-enhancement typically use a target of evaluation that is theoretically more meaningful to those from Western cultures (i.e., the individual self),

it is reasonable to be concerned that if a study demonstrates an absence of self-enhancing tendencies among Japanese, the result may be due to its evaluation of a target that is inconsequential to Japanese. Perhaps people from both Western and Eastern cultures have similar tendencies to enhance themselves, yet they enhance the view of self most meaningful to them. That is, individualistic North Americans may be motivated to enhance their individual selves, whereas Japanese may be motivated to enhance their collective selves. This view suggests that past cultural differences in self-enhancement reflect differences in content (the target of the evaluation) rather than differences in process (the motivation to see the self, or one's group, in a positive light; Fiske, Kitayama, Markus, & Nisbett, in press; Greenfield, in press). If this is the case, Japanese should exhibit group-serving biases at a level comparable to North Americans' SSBs.

Perspectives reflecting the differences-in-content position have emerged in the psychoanalytic literature of the Japanese. For example, Roland (1988) has maintained that there is a parallel between Americans being concerned with their "I-self regard" and Japanese being concerned with their "we-self regard." Similarly, Johnson (1993) has argued that Japanese are socialized to transform their feelings of personal narcissism and vanity into a sense of group pride and collective narcissism. And De Vos (1973) has contended that Japanese aspire toward succeeding as a group in contrast to Americans, who aspire to succeed as individuals. These perspectives suggest fundamental similarities between the underlying psychological processes of Japanese and North Americans yet differences in the nature of the self that these processes sustain.

Culture and Group-Serving Biases

These two opposing views of the nature of previously detected cultural differences in SSBs make opposite predictions regarding cultural differences in group-serving biases. The differences-in-process view assumes that North American culture places greater importance on viewing oneself positively than does Japanese culture (Heine et al., 1997; Kitayama et al., 1997). To the extent that one's groups reflect on the individual, this view predicts that North Americans should exhibit group-serving biases to a greater extent than Japanese. That considerable research conducted in the West shows that feelings of self-worth are promoted by positive evaluations of individuals' groups (e.g., Brown, Collins, & Schmidt, 1988; Lemyre & Smith, 1985; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) suggests that group-serving biases may indeed serve to enhance the individual self as well.

In contrast, the differences-in-content view assumes the existence of similar motivations for self-enhancement across cultures. An implication of this view is that SSBs should be most prominent when individuals evaluate their most meaningful view of self. Given the collectivist, group-oriented nature of the Japanese (Hamaguchi, 1985; Kondo, 1987; Markus & Kitayama, 1991b), switching the target from the individual to the individual's group should yield a view of self more meaningful to Japanese than to North Americans. To the extent that motivations to enhance the self are similar across cultures, Japanese should show more pronounced group-serving biases than North Americans.

Past Research on Group-Serving Biases

A review of studies of group-serving biases with Asian (albeit primarily non-Japanese) and North American participants is more in line with the differences-in-process view. Group-serving bias studies with Asian participants have yielded inconsistent results (Fletcher & Ward, 1988). Some studies have found evidence for group-serving biases in people from Asian cultures. For example, D. M. Taylor and Jaggi (1974) showed that Hindus made internal attributions for other Hindus who performed socially desirable acts and external attributions for those who acted in socially undesirable ways. In contrast, when Hindus made attributions for the behavior of Muslims, the reverse pattern was found. This study is problematic, however, because Muslims are a minority group of lower status than Hindus, and the reciprocal attributions from this group were not solicited (Hewstone & Ward, 1985).

Hewstone, Bond, and Wan (1983) reported that Chinese students from two universities in Hong Kong made group-serving attributions favoring their respective universities. A later study yielded somewhat limited evidence of group-serving biases in terms of sex-typed behaviors for Chinese students in Hong Kong (Bond, Hewstone, Wan, & Chiu, 1985). However, the robustness of group-serving effects with Chinese participants is challenged. Bond et al. (1985) discovered that American students displayed a more pronounced group-serving bias for sex-typed behaviors than did Chinese students, and a study of Chinese in Singapore by Hewstone and Ward (1985) found no evidence for group-serving biases at all. Hence, studies of group-serving biases with Chinese have not presented a clear picture.

A few recent studies of group-serving biases with Japanese participants have also produced inconsistent results. For example, Muramoto and Yamaguchi (1997) have shown that Japanese are more likely to make group-serving attributions than self-serving attributions in a minimal groups context. In another study, Muramoto, Yamaguchi, Kim, Kosaka, and Yu (1997) demonstrated that Japanese who make group-serving attributions are liked more than those who make group-effacing attributions, whereas the opposite pattern was evident for attributions about their individual selves. These two studies are consistent with the differences-in-content view. However, two other studies with Japanese participants failed to demonstrate group-serving biases. Kitayama, Palm, Masuda, Karasawa, and Carroll (1996) measured perceptions of vulnerability to earthquakes in two high-risk cities in Japan and two cities in the United States. Results showed that Americans from both cities demonstrated group-serving tendencies by stating that the other city was slightly less prepared for earthquakes than their own. In contrast, Japanese participants from both cities reported that their own city was significantly less prepared than the other. That is, Japanese showed unrealistic pessimism toward their own city.

Heine and Lehman (1995a) presented Japanese and Canadians with a list of possible negative future life events that specifically threatened the individual's interpersonal network. They found that Japanese demonstrated even less unrealistic optimism (or more unrealistic pessimism) for these events than they did for events that simply threatened the individual. This pattern was not obtained for the Canadian participants. Taken together, the literature does not indicate consistent group-serving tendencies among Asians.

In contrast, there is considerable evidence that North Americans do exhibit group-serving biases. Research on North Americans has shown that attributional biases, whereby individuals take credit for successes and explain away failures (see Zuckerman, 1979), generalize to the group level. For example, players and coaches of baseball and football teams make more attributional biases regarding their wins and losses than do sportswriters (Lau & Russell, 1980); individuals are at least as, if not more, self-serving when they interpret their spouse's outcomes as when they interpret their own outcomes (Fincham, Beach, & Baucom, 1987); and people make group-serving attributions when their group succeeds and jointly absolve each other of responsibility when their group fails (Forsyth & Schlenker, 1977). Other SSBs have been shown to generalize from oneself to one's friends. For example, individuals view positive personality traits to be more characteristic of their close friends than of others (Brown, 1986), and people believe that future negative life events are more likely to happen to the average other than to their close friends (Perloff & Fetzer, 1986).

A study by Crocker, Thompson, McGraw, and Ingerman (1987, Study 2) demonstrated group-serving biases among sorority members. They found that members of sororities evaluated rival sororities more negatively than their own, particularly when the participants were members of low-status sororities. Brown et al. (1988) investigated group-serving biases in a minimal-groups paradigm. They demonstrated that individuals tended to evaluate products made by their in-groups more positively than those made by out-groups and that this effect was more pronounced after participants received negative feedback. Cialdini and Richardson (1980) found that students viewed their university more positively than a rival university, particularly following failure feedback.

Cialdini et al. (1976) demonstrated that individuals affiliate themselves more with successful than with unsuccessful groups. They argued that individuals feel good about themselves when they are associated with positively viewed groups because they are able to bask in the reflected glory of the group's success. Conversely, when their groups are viewed negatively, individuals are motivated to distance themselves from this reflected failure (e.g., Cialdini et al., 1976; Snyder, Lassegard, & Ford, 1986; S. E. Taylor & Mettee, 1971).

For North Americans, affiliating themselves with positively viewed groups and holding unrealistically positive views of their groups appear to enhance their self-evaluations (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Group memberships, even for independently oriented North Americans, form an important part of their individual self-concepts (e.g., James, 1950/1890), thereby suggesting that individual self-evaluations are served by enhancing one's group evaluations. Research (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) that has shown collective self-esteem (i.e., the extent to which one views one's social groups positively) to be correlated positively with global self-esteem corroborates this relation. Moreover, that some of the aforementioned group-enhancement studies (e.g., Brown et al., 1988; Cialdini et al., 1976; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Crocker et al., 1987) demonstrated increased group-serving tendencies when participants were confronted with threats to the self underscores the self-enhancing role that they play.

Present Research

We sought to pit the differences-in-process view and the differences-in-content view against each other by investigating how

individuals evaluate the people with whom they are connected and the groups to which they belong. In Study 1, we measured how Canadians and Japanese evaluated a close family member relative to others and how they evaluated themselves relative to others. In Study 2, we compared how Canadian and Japanese students evaluated their own and a rival university. In both studies, we assessed collective self-esteem as another means to investigate how positively people evaluate their groups.

Because the Canadian data were collected in Vancouver, a city with a large Asian community, we partitioned the Canadian data for both studies into participants of European ancestry and those of Asian ancestry. This third cultural group, Asian Canadians, although heterogeneous both in terms of country of origin and in terms of length of time and number of generations in Canada, falls in between the groups of European Canadians and Japanese in terms of exposure to Western cultural values (Heine & Lehman, 1997c). To the extent that culture mediates evaluations of one's groups, we anticipated that Asian Canadians would show group-serving biases intermediate to those of European Canadians and Japanese.

Study 1

Method

Participants

The Japanese sample consisted of students from Ritsumeikan University in Kyoto who completed the questionnaire packet 1 month before leaving Japan for a 7-month study-abroad program in Canada. Of the 93 students in the program, 82 (55 women and 27 men) agreed to participate in the study. It deserves mention that these students, having chosen to live abroad for an academic year, may be more Western-oriented than the average Japanese individual. If anything, however, this should reduce the likelihood of observing cross-cultural differences.

The Canadian sample consisted of 151 students enrolled in introductory psychology classes at the University of British Columbia (UBC). We separated this sample by ethnic background to further examine cultural differences. Forty-four (28 women and 16 men) declared themselves to be of Asian heritage and formed what we term the *Asian Canadian* sample. Seventy-five (57 women and 18 men) declared themselves to be of European heritage and formed what we term the *European Canadian* sample. The remaining 32 students were of varied ethnic backgrounds (e.g., mixed ethnicities, Latin American descent, and African descent) and were not included in the analyses.

Materials

All data were collected by questionnaire. After answering some demographic questions, participants were asked to write down the name of, and their relation to, the member of their family to whom they felt closest. They were then asked to indicate how close they were to this family member on a scale of 1 (*not at all close*) to 10 (*extremely close*). Next, they were asked to complete a section of the questionnaire that assessed their degree of family-member-serving biases: They were asked to estimate the percentage of the population of the same age and gender as their chosen family member that was better than this family member with respect to 10 traits. Five of these traits were chosen to be particularly meaningful to the independent view of self (attractive, interesting, independent, confident, and intelligent), and 5 were chosen to be particularly meaningful to the interdependent view of self (cooperative, loyal, considerate, hard-working, and dependable; Markus & Kitayama, 1991b).

Subsequently, participants were asked to complete a section of the questionnaire that assessed their degree of SSBs: They were asked to

estimate the percentage of the population of the same age and gender as themselves that was better than they with respect to the same 10 traits. Last, participants completed Rosenberg's (1965) 10-item Global Self-Esteem Scale and Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) Collective Self-Esteem (CSE) Scale. The CSE Scale is composed of four 4-item subscales: Membership, Private, Public, and Identity. Membership CSE refers to the extent to which individuals feel that they are worthy members of their social groups. Private CSE indicates how satisfied one is about being a member of her or his social group. Public CSE assesses how individuals feel that others view their social groups. Identity CSE measures the importance of an individual's social group to her or his self-concept. Participants completed both Rosenberg's and Luhtanen and Crocker's self-esteem scales using 5-point Likert-type scales, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

The materials were originally produced in English and then translated into Japanese. Then, after an independent translator back-translated the Japanese version into English, three translators discussed and resolved any inconsistencies between the versions.

Results and Discussion

Comparability of the Samples

There was a significant difference in the average ages of the three samples, $F(2, 198) = 5.44, p < .01$, with post hoc comparisons (Tukey's honestly significantly different [HSD] test for unequal numbers for all post hoc comparisons in Study 1) revealing that the European Canadian sample ($M = 21.2$ years) was significantly older than either the Asian Canadian sample ($M = 19.9$ years) or the Japanese sample ($M = 20.0$ years). However, given that correlational analyses revealed that age did not significantly relate to any of the dependent variables (all r s between $-.10$ and $.03, ns$), this age difference does not confound the cultural comparisons. Each of the samples was predominantly female (67% of Japanese, 64% of Asian Canadians, and 76% of European Canadians were women). Gender was included as a factor in all analyses; however, for the sake of brevity, main effects for gender and Gender \times Culture interactions are reported only for instances in which they reached conventional levels of significance.

SSBs and Family-Serving Biases

SSBs and family-serving biases (FSBs) were operationalized as the discrepancy between participants' overall estimates and what would be expected if participants were to have answered accurately. It is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain precisely what entails "accurate" responding by individuals. If we can assume a normal distribution of the population and that our samples were not substantially different from the general population at large with respect to the traits, then on average, there should be approximately 50% of the population "better" than the research participants with regard to the traits. We realize that these assumptions are debatable. Samples consisting of university students may reasonably be argued to be better than average on certain traits. However, lacking more objective criteria, we adopted the 50% benchmark as the touchstone from which to describe the magnitude of enhancement biases. This operationalization of *bias* exists simply for illustrative purposes. Our primary concern is with the cultural differences in the magnitude of self-enhancing biases, not with the absolute magnitude of the biases per se; the lack of precision of the accuracy bench-

mark does not confound the cultural comparisons. Using this 50% benchmark, we calculated SSBs and FSBs by subtracting each of the participant's population estimates for the 10 traits from 50%. Any estimate that was significantly less than 50% across the entire sample was termed an *enhancement bias*.

We analyzed the five interdependent and the five independent traits separately to assess whether participants responded to them differently. Reliability tests for each set of five traits were conducted for both measures of SSBs and FSBs. Cronbach's alphas were .81 and .79 for interdependent and independent FSB traits and .84 and .86 for interdependent and independent SSB traits, respectively. This indicates that within each set of traits, participants tended to estimate that roughly the same percentage of people were better than either they or their family members, regardless of the traits under consideration. Therefore, we averaged the five traits for both sets of independent and interdependent traits for both measures of SSBs and FSBs to arrive at an overall estimate of the degree of bias.

SSBs. When we examined the cultural traits for the SSB measure, a significant Gender \times Culture interaction emerged, $F(2, 193) = 3.29, p < .04$. Simple effects analyses revealed that Japanese women estimated that significantly more people were better than they ($M = 53\%$) than did Japanese men ($M = 42\%$), $F(1, 79) = 8.09, p < .01$. Japanese women did not show evidence of SSBs for the independent traits (i.e., their estimates were not significantly different from 50%, $t < 1$). In contrast, Japanese men showed a significant overall SSB, $t(25) = 2.33, p < .05$. No gender differences emerged for either Asian Canadians ($F < 1$) or European Canadians, $F(1, 73) = 2.97, p < .09$, and thus we examined men and women together (see Table 1). Both Asian Canadians' and European Canadians' self-estimates were significantly lower than 50%, $t(42) = 5.80$ and $t(74) = 13.12$, respectively, both $ps < .001$, across the five traits, thereby exhibiting a pronounced overall SSB for the independent traits.

A highly significant main effect for culture emerged, $F(2, 193) = 27.65, p < .001$, which post hoc comparisons revealed was the result of both Asian Canadians and European Canadians demonstrating a more pronounced SSB than Japanese, and Asian

Canadians falling squarely in between. Hence, we observed a clear relation between SSBs and culture for the independent traits.

An examination of the interdependent traits for the SSB measure again revealed a significant Gender \times Culture interaction, $F(2, 191) = 4.45, p < .02$. Simple effects analyses revealed a pattern similar to the independent traits pattern in that Japanese women estimated that significantly more people were better than they with respect to the interdependent traits ($M = 48\%$) than did Japanese men ($M = 40\%$), $F(1, 78) = 5.31, p < .03$. Japanese women did not show evidence of SSBs for the interdependent traits either, as their estimates were not significantly different from 50%, $t(53) = 1.37, ns$, whereas Japanese men again showed significant SSBs, $t(25) = 3.37, p < .01$. These analyses did not reveal gender differences for either Asian Canadians, $F(1, 40) = 2.13, ns$, or European Canadians, $F(1, 73) = 1.07, ns$, for the interdependent traits, and thus we again examined men and women together. Both Asian Canadians' and European Canadians' self-estimates showed pronounced SSBs, $t(41) = 11.28$ and $t(74) = 19.61$, respectively, both $ps < .001$, across the five interdependent traits, a result that replicates the pattern for the independent traits.

The analysis with the interdependent traits also revealed a highly significant main effect for culture, $F(2, 191) = 43.32, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons demonstrated that both Asian Canadians and European Canadians showed a more pronounced SSB than did Japanese. The magnitude of the bias for Asian Canadians was between that of European Canadians and Japanese, as we anticipated, although it did not differ significantly from the bias of European Canadians.

The final set of analyses conducted on the SSBs were comparisons of the magnitude of the bias between the independent and interdependent traits. Repeated measures analyses revealed more pronounced biases for the interdependent traits than for the independent traits in Japanese, $F(1, 78) = 3.16, p < .08$; Asian Canadians, $F(1, 40) = 18.77, p < .001$; and European Canadians, $F(1, 73) = 4.91, p < .03$. Interdependent traits, then, appear to lend themselves more to self-enhancement, irrespective of culture.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Dependent Measures in Study 1

| Measure | Japanese | | Asian Canadians | | European Canadians | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Self-serving biases | | | | | | |
| Independent items | 47.3% _a | 16.0 | 36.3% _b | 16.2 | 27.5% _c | 13.8 |
| Interdependent items | 43.9% _a | 13.8 | 27.4% _b | 13.5 | 23.7% _c | 12.0 |
| Family-serving biases | | | | | | |
| Independent items | 38.6% _a | 14.3 | 28.0% _b | 16.2 | 23.5% _b | 12.6 |
| Interdependent items | 30.6% _a | 13.9 | 20.4% _b | 16.2 | 18.5% _b | 13.3 |
| Rosenberg Global Self-Esteem | 34.0 _a | 6.77 | 36.4 _{ab} | 5.85 | 39.4 _b | 6.00 |
| Membership CSE | 14.5 _a | 2.54 | 15.3 _{ab} | 2.19 | 16.1 _b | 2.00 |
| Private CSE | 16.0 _a | 3.02 | 15.5 _a | 2.32 | 16.2 _a | 2.15 |
| Public CSE | 14.1 _a | 2.40 | 15.0 _{ab} | 1.80 | 15.4 _b | 2.07 |
| Identity CSE | 13.4 _a | 3.03 | 13.7 _a | 2.90 | 13.5 _a | 2.51 |

Note. Within each row, means with different subscripts are significantly different at $p < .01$. CSE = Collective Self-Esteem.

FSBs. Next, participants' evaluations of their family members were assessed for group-serving tendencies. Analyses of FSBs for the independent traits revealed no effects for gender or for a Gender \times Culture interaction. A highly significant main effect for culture again emerged, $F(2, 190) = 18.49, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that compared with Japanese, both Asian Canadians and European Canadians reported that a significantly smaller percentage of the population was better than their family member. Again, the population estimates of Asian Canadians fell between those of European Canadians and Japanese in terms of the magnitude of the bias, although the difference with European Canadians was not significant. All samples showed significant FSBs, as their estimates were lower than 50%, $t(78) = 7.00, t(41) = 8.82$, and $t(74) = 17.95$, all $ps < .001$, for Japanese, Asian Canadian, and European Canadians, respectively, yet the tendency was more pronounced for both samples of Canadians. Moreover, the magnitude of FSBs was significantly larger than the magnitude of SSBs for the independent traits within each sample, $F(1, 76) = 15.37, F(1, 40) = 11.04$, and $F(1, 73) = 5.34$, all $ps < .03$, for Japanese, Asian Canadians, and European Canadians, respectively.

An examination of the FSBs for interdependent traits revealed a similar pattern. The only significant effect was a main effect for culture, $F(2, 190) = 12.84, p < .001$, which post hoc comparisons revealed was again the result of Japanese estimating that a significantly greater percentage of the population was better than their family member when compared with both Asian Canadians and European Canadians. The population estimates of Asian Canadians again were between those of European Canadians and Japanese, although they were not significantly different from those of European Canadians. Significant FSBs for the interdependent traits were demonstrated by all cultural groups, $t(78) = 11.98, t(41) = 11.77$, and $t(74) = 20.99$, all $ps < .001$, for Japanese, Asian Canadians, and European Canadians, respectively. As was the case for the independent traits, the magnitude of FSBs was significantly larger than the magnitude of SSBs for the interdependent traits within each cultural group, $F(1, 76) = 43.83, F(1, 40) = 8.92$, and $F(1, 73) = 8.46$, all $ps < .005$, for Japanese, Asian Canadians, and European Canadians, respectively.

Last, we conducted repeated measures analyses for the FSBs between the independent and interdependent traits. Significant effects emerged for each cultural group, Japanese, $F(1, 77) = 16.86, p < .001$; Asian Canadian, $F(1, 40) = 12.32, p < .002$; and European Canadian, $F(1, 73) = 11.42, p < .002$, again with the interdependent traits having larger biases than the independent traits. Regardless of whether participants made estimates for their family members or for themselves and regardless of cultural group, more pronounced biases were evident for the interdependent traits than for the independent traits. This result may be owing to the possibilities that the interdependent traits are less concrete and that participants have had less experience being evaluated on them. As research on self-enhancement in North America has shown (e.g., Dunning, Meyerowitz, & Holzberg, 1989; Felson, 1981), the more intangible the characteristic is, the more likely people are to demonstrate a bias.

Summary. Reinforcing past cross-cultural studies of SSBs (Heine & Lehman, 1995a, 1997b; Kitayama et al., 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991a), our results showed that when Japanese

evaluated themselves, their estimates did not deviate much from the 50% benchmark (although the SSB effect was evident for Japanese men in Study 1). Typically in the literature, however, North Americans exhibit pronounced SSBs (for reviews, see Greenwald, 1980; Taylor & Brown, 1988), and likewise, in Study 1, both Asian Canadians' and European Canadians' estimates deviated sizably from the 50% benchmark and were significantly more biased than Japanese participants' estimates, for both independent and interdependent traits. That Asian Canadians exhibited results between those of the two more homogeneous cultures corroborates the notion that SSBs are more pronounced in Western cultures.

In this study, we were primarily interested in examining positive evaluations toward one's group. When evaluating a close member of their family, Japanese demonstrated a FSB in that for both sets of traits, their population estimates were lower than the 50% benchmark and were significantly more biased than were their self-evaluations. By itself, this trend could be seen as support for the differences-in-content view—that is, group-oriented Japanese showed more pronounced group-serving biases than SSBs (as assessed by the 50% benchmark). However, both Asian Canadians and European Canadians also demonstrated significantly more pronounced biases when evaluating their family members than when evaluating themselves, and more important, these biases were significantly more pronounced than they were for Japanese. So, although people from each of the cultural groups exhibited FSBs, both samples of Canadians did so significantly more than did the Japanese sample. That Asian Canadians exhibited biases that were between those of European Canadians and Japanese underscores the relation between Western culture and positively biased views about one's family. We suggest that this cross-cultural pattern of results supports the differences-in-process view.

One artifactual possibility for why members of both cultures enhanced more for their family members than for themselves deserves comment. Given that participants chose the family member that they felt closest to, it is plausible that this individual was selected, in part, because he or she was deemed to possess several positive characteristics. Perhaps one reason that participants rated their family members more positively relative to others than they did for themselves is that they selected their "best" family member, someone who, in their eyes, is better than average. This issue suggests that perhaps the 50% benchmark may not be the most appropriate point from which to assess FSBs. This potential artifact, however, does not reduce the importance of the finding that both groups of Canadians rated their family member more positively than did the Japanese group.

Cultural Differences on the Self-Esteem Scales

Consistent with past research results (Bond & Cheung, 1983; Campbell et al., 1996; Mahler, 1976), a significant difference emerged between the cultural groups in terms of global self-esteem, $F(2, 194) = 11.38, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that European Canadians had significantly higher global self-esteem scores than Japanese. Again, Asian Canadians fell in the intermediate range, but they were not significantly different from either of the other two samples.

Significant main effects for culture emerged on two of the

four subscales of Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) CSE measure. A significant analysis of variance (ANOVA), $F(2, 194) = 8.10$, $p < .001$, followed by post hoc comparisons, revealed that European Canadians had significantly higher Membership CSE scores than Japanese. Asian Canadians fell in between the other two samples but did not differ significantly from either sample. European Canadians, then, viewed themselves as more worthy members of their social groups than did Japanese. Because this subscale consistently correlates highly with global self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) and the items are similar to global self-esteem items in terms of evaluating an individual's self-worth, this cultural difference may reflect the tendencies of North Americans to think more highly of themselves as individuals than Japanese do (Heine et al., 1997).

A similar main effect for culture emerged for Public CSE, $F(2, 193) = 6.03$, $p < .01$.¹ Again, European Canadians endorsed the items in this measure significantly more than Japanese, and Asian Canadians fell nonsignificantly between the two. Thus, European Canadians felt that others evaluated their social groups more positively than did the Japanese. Reflecting the obtained cultural difference in the magnitude of FSBs, this finding is evidence that European Canadians have more positive views of their groups than do Japanese. The intermediate result of Asian Canadians adds further support to this notion.

Cultural differences did not emerge for either the Private or the Identity subscale of the CSE Scale (both F s < 1). None of the three cultural groups differed in their satisfaction with their memberships in their social groups or with the importance they ascribed to their social groups in influencing their identity.

Correlations Between FSBs and Other Dependent Measures

An examination of the correlations between the magnitude of the FSBs for both independent and interdependent traits and the other dependent measures suggests how family-member enhancement is related to self-enhancement for Canadians. First, both Asian Canadians and European Canadians exhibited highly significant positive correlations, for both independent and interdependent traits, between the percentage of people they viewed as better than themselves and the percentage they viewed as better than their close family members (see Table 2). The more likely individuals were to see themselves in a positive manner relative to others, the more likely they were to view their family members in such a way. Self-enhancement, then, was closely tied to family-member enhancement for both groups of Canadians. Japanese exhibited significant positive correlations between their SSBs for independent traits and both types of FSBs but not between their SSBs for interdependent traits and FSBs. Hence, they, too, displayed some tendencies (albeit inconsistent ones) to think better of their family members, relative to others, if they thought well of themselves. However, with the exception of the correlation between SSBs for independent traits and FSBs for interdependent traits, both the Asian Canadian and the European Canadian correlations were significantly or marginally significantly larger than the Japanese correlations (the p s on these other three correlations ranged from .001 to .08), suggesting that the relation between self-enhancement and family-member enhancement is less pronounced for Japanese than it is for both groups of Canadians.

Second, European Canadians exhibited significant negative correlations between how close they reported being to their family member and the percentage of the population they estimated as being better than that family member, for both independent and interdependent traits (p s $< .002$). That is, the closer European Canadians felt to their family member, the better they thought their family member was relative to others. This suggests that European Canadians enhance themselves indirectly when they rate their family member positively. In contrast, Japanese did not exhibit significant correlations between their reported closeness to their family member and their estimates of the percentage of the population better than this person for either set of traits (both ns). The European Canadian correlations were marginally greater in magnitude than those of the Japanese (both p s $< .10$). Japanese did not evaluate their family members more positively when they felt closer to them, and thus FSBs do not appear to be an indirect form of self-enhancement for Japanese. The same correlations for Asian Canadians fell between those of European Canadians and Japanese but did not reach significance (both ns). There was no difference in the magnitude of the correlations between Asian Canadians and either of the other two cultural groups (both ns).

Third, European Canadians exhibited a significant negative correlation between their global self-esteem score and the percentage of people they estimated as being better than their family member for both types of traits (both p s $< .03$). Viewing one's family member in positive terms was thus related to how European Canadians evaluated themselves. For Japanese and Asian Canadians, there was no relation between these two variables (all ns). Last, there were no consistent patterns of correlations between FSBs and the subscales of the CSE Scale.

European Canadians' tendencies to display FSBs, then, seem to reflect their own positive feelings about themselves. For European Canadians, it appears that thinking positively about their family members is one way of thinking positively about themselves, although the direction of this causal relation is not clear. They appear to bask in the reflected glory of their family members (Cialdini et al., 1976). Aside from the correlations between SSBs for independent traits and the two sets of FSBs, the results of the Japanese sample do not indicate that thinking positively about their family members serves to enhance themselves. The relations between FSBs and positive self-feelings were inconsistent for the Asian Canadians. It is important to note that given that the standard deviations for all the variables were comparable across the cultural groups, the attenuated correlations for Japanese do not appear to be a function of a restricted range or of Japanese demonstrating moderation response styles (see Chen, Lee, & Stevenson, 1995).

In sum, Study 1 demonstrates that Japanese exhibit some tendencies to enhance their family members but that these tendencies are not as strong as they are for European Canadians, nor are they as strongly linked to Japanese' self-evaluations. Also, Japanese exhibited significantly lower Public CSE than European Canadians, indicating that they felt that others evaluated their groups less positively. That the results of Asian Canadians were, for the most part, between those of these two cultural

¹ A significant main effect for gender emerged for Public CSE, $F(1, 193) = 5.14$, $p < .03$, with women ($M = 15.2$) scoring higher than men ($M = 14.4$).

Table 2
Correlations Between Family-Serving Biases and Other Dependent Measures

| Measure | Japanese FSB | | Asian Canadian FSB | | European Canadian FSB | |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| | Independent | Interdependent | Independent | Interdependent | Independent | Interdependent |
| FSB—Independent | — | .32** | — | .66** | — | .64** |
| FSB—Interdependent | .32** | — | .66** | — | .64** | — |
| SSB—Independent | .26* | .27* | .64** | .52** | .53** | .35** |
| SSB—Interdependent | -.16 | .20 | .49** | .52** | .49** | .46** |
| Closeness | -.09 | -.12 | -.21 | -.12 | -.36** | -.37** |
| Rosenberg Global Self-Esteem | -.03 | -.13 | -.11 | .06 | -.32** | -.26* |
| Membership CSE | .05 | -.12 | .00 | -.02 | -.16 | -.19 |
| Private CSE | -.07 | -.09 | -.02 | .16 | -.04 | -.10 |
| Public CSE | .07 | -.01 | -.21 | -.05 | -.18 | -.25* |
| Identity CSE | .05 | -.31** | -.05 | .10 | -.02 | -.01 |

Note. FSB = family-serving bias; SSB = self-serving bias; CSE = Collective Self-Esteem.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

groups increases our confidence that positive views of one's group are more pronounced for people from Western than from Eastern cultures.

Study 2

One limitation of Study 1 is that the target of evaluation for the FSBs, although not the self, was nonetheless an individual. Perhaps the obtained cultural difference in FSBs reflects a relative hesitation by Japanese to view any individual in unrealistically positive terms. A positively biased evaluation of an individual might highlight how that individual is different from others—something that may have negative psychological consequences for Japanese (Markus & Kitayama, 1991b). Study 2 thus focused specifically on cultural differences in evaluating the groups to which one belongs, in this case, participants' universities.

Method

Universities

Two universities were selected each from Japan and Canada. We took care to select universities that would be comparable across the two cultures. For the Japanese sample, we selected Doshisha University and Ritsumeikan University. Both universities are located in Kyoto, Japan, a city of approximately 1.3 million people. Doshisha and Ritsumeikan are both private schools of similar size, and although there are a number of other universities in and around Kyoto, these two have had a historical rivalry. The rankings of Japanese schools are well publicized and change little from year to year. Doshisha and Ritsumeikan are commonly known as the third and fourth best private schools in western Japan, respectively. The academic standards necessary for entry are slightly higher for Doshisha than for Ritsumeikan.

UBC and Simon Fraser University (SFU) were selected for the Canadian sample. Both of these universities are located in greater Vancouver, Canada, which has a population of approximately 1.8 million. The two are both public schools, and being the only universities in the Vancouver area, they too have a history of rivalry. Although the ranking of Canadian schools is not particularly clear-cut, both schools are typically viewed quite positively. A recent national survey showed that UBC and SFU were rated as having the second and fourth best overall reputations in Canada, respectively, in their categories (Maclean's, 1994). The aca-

demic standards necessary for entry are slightly higher for UBC than for SFU.

Participants

Eighty-six introductory psychology students (57 women, 27 men, and 2 who did not report their gender) formed the sample from Doshisha. The Ritsumeikan sample consisted of 141 students (63 women and 78 men) from an urban studies course. All Japanese participants had Japanese parents, and all but 1 were born in Japan.

The UBC sample comprised 191 introductory psychology students, and the SFU sample comprised 178 introductory psychology or research methods students. As in Study 1, we separated the Canadian samples in terms of their ethnic background. Fifty-eight students (37 women and 21 men) from UBC and 47 students (33 women and 14 men) from SFU declared themselves to be of Asian ancestry and were termed Asian Canadians. One hundred six students (74 women and 32 men) from UBC, and 108 students (81 women and 27 men) from SFU declared themselves to be of European ancestry and were termed European Canadians. The remaining 27 students from UBC and 23 students from SFU were of varied ethnic descent and were not included in the analyses.

Materials

Participants were first asked to evaluate characteristics of universities and students for both their own and their rival university. They were provided with 5 statements about the characteristics of the two universities and 10 statements about the characteristics of students from the two universities, and they were asked to indicate how accurate the statements were on a 1 (*not at all accurate*) to 6 (*completely accurate*) scale (see Appendix). We selected half of the characteristics of students to be typical of the independent view of self and half to be typical of the interdependent view of self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991b). The questionnaires were counterbalanced such that half of the participants evaluated their own university first and half evaluated their rival university first.

Participants then completed a modified version of the CSE Scale. We altered the 16 items on the scale by replacing the generic target "my social group" with the more specific target "my university." Hence, the subscale measured what we term *university self-esteem* (USE). As in the original measure, there were four subscales: Membership, Private, Public, and Identity USE. Previous research (Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) has shown that such modifications do not compromise the psychometric properties of the scale.

Participants were then asked how well they knew students from their rival university. This item was included as a control for differences in the familiarity of students with their rival universities. Two items followed that served as additional measures of university-enhancing tendencies. The first item was "Overall, I think that [UBC/Doshisha] is a better school to go to than [SFU/Ritsumeikan]," and the second item was "I think that most [UBC/Doshisha] students are glad that they went to [UBC/Doshisha] instead of [SFU/Ritsumeikan]." We included these final two items to test for cultural differences in university-serving tendencies using different kinds of measures. Finally, participants completed some demographic items. All materials were originally produced in English and then translated into Japanese using the same procedure as in Study 1.

Results and Discussion

Comparability of the Samples

An ANOVA revealed significant age differences across the groups, $F(5, 535) = 9.08, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons (Tukey's HSD test for unequal numbers for all analyses in Study 2) revealed that the only difference was that the European Canadian SFU sample ($M = 23.0$ years) was significantly older than each of the other samples (M s ranged from 20.3 to 20.9 years). However, correlations within cultures with age and all of the dependent variables revealed a significant correlation in only one isolated instance, which is discussed later.

The samples differed with respect to proportions of the genders, $\chi^2(5, N = 546) = 31.1, p < .001$. Gender was included as a factor for all analyses. No significant interactions with gender were observed, and only two isolated significant main effects for gender emerged. For the sake of brevity, aside from these two exceptions, analyses with gender are not discussed.

Comparisons of Evaluations of Universities and Students

Reliability analyses revealed that the university evaluation scale (Cronbach's alphas for the four target universities ranged from .68 to .82), the independent trait scale (alphas ranged from .67 to .82), and the interdependent trait scale (alphas ranged from .70 to .79) all formed reasonably cohesive measures (especially given that the scales consisted of only five items each) and indicated that participants tended to evaluate the universities and students from the universities in roughly the same way regardless of the characteristic under consideration. Therefore, we summed the items from each of these three measures to form composite measures for analyses.

University evaluations. We first examined whether students would evaluate their own universities or students from their universities more positively than would students from their rival universities and, conversely, whether students would rate their rival universities or students from those universities more negatively than would students from those universities. We term this tendency a *university-serving bias* (USB). We used a repeated measures design to analyze participants' evaluations of their own and their rival universities for all analyses. In line with the differences-in-process view, we anticipated that USBs would be more pronounced for European Canadians than for Japanese.

A three-way (Culture \times School \times Target) analysis was first conducted for the five-item university-evaluation measure. Because the predicted three-way interaction was significant, $F(2,$

537) = 15.04, $p < .001$, we conducted follow-up analyses of School \times Target interactions within each culture. We first examined the Japanese sample and found the two-way interaction to be significant, $F(1, 224) = 13.74, p < .001$. Simple effects analyses revealed that this interaction was accounted for by the fact that although students from both universities evaluated Ritsumeikan less positively than Doshisha, students from Ritsumeikan viewed the relative superiority of Doshisha to be greater than did students from Doshisha, $F(1, 139) = 142.99, p < .001$, and $F(1, 85) = 17.62, p < .001$, for students from Ritsumeikan and Doshisha, respectively.² That is, the university evaluations from both Ritsumeikan and Doshisha students reflect the common knowledge that Doshisha has higher academic standards than Ritsumeikan, yet the interaction is evidence for a university-effacing bias (see Table 3). In stark contrast to what would be expected if Japanese were group serving, Ritsumeikan students believed that Doshisha is more superior to Ritsumeikan than did Doshisha students.

The two-way interaction was also significant for European Canadians, $F(1, 210) = 15.12, p < .001$. Simple effects analyses revealed that this interaction was accounted for by the fact that although students from both universities evaluated UBC more positively than SFU, UBC students viewed the gap between UBC and SFU as larger than did SFU students, $F(1, 104) = 73.85, p < .001$, and $F(1, 106) = 14.23, p < .001$, for students from UBC and SFU, respectively. In sum, the university evaluations made by the European Canadian students from UBC and SFU both reflected the higher academic standards of UBC, but UBC students saw the relative superiority of UBC as greater than did SFU students. This interaction is evidence of USBs for European Canadians.

The two-way interaction was marginally significant for Asian Canadians, $F(1, 103) = 3.18, p < .08$. Simple effects analyses revealed that this marginal interaction was accounted for by the fact that although students from both universities evaluated UBC more positively than SFU, UBC students viewed the gap between UBC and SFU as marginally larger than did SFU students, $F(1, 57) = 17.14, p < .001$, and $F(1, 46) = 6.14, p < .02$, for students from UBC and SFU, respectively. The marginal USB exhibited by Asian Canadians thus falls between that of the other two cultural groups.

Independent trait evaluations. The same analyses were conducted for evaluations of the students for the independent traits. Again, the predicted three-way (Culture \times School \times Target) interaction was significant, $F(2, 528) = 3.84, p < .03$. Follow-up analyses demonstrated that Japanese did not show a significant School \times Target interaction, $F(1, 219) = 2.43, p > .10$. That is, they did not show either significant USBs or university-effacing biases for the independent traits. Simple effects analyses by school did reveal, however, that Doshisha students viewed Doshisha students more positively than Ritsumeikan students, $F(1, 82) = 4.53, p < .05$, whereas the Ritsumeikan students showed no difference ($F < 1$). Hence, the Japanese showed a nonsignificant trend toward USBs for the independent traits.

² A main effect for gender emerged here for the Doshisha sample, $F(1, 82) = 7.64, p < .01$. Simple effects analyses revealed that Doshisha women rated Ritsumeikan ($M = 17.8$) lower than they did Doshisha ($M = 20.4$), $F(1, 56) = 28.61, p < .001$, whereas men showed no difference, $F(1, 26) < 1$.

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Student Evaluations in Study 2

| Evaluator | Target | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Japanese | | Asian Canadians | | European Canadians | |
| | Doshisha | Ritsumeikan | UBC | SFU | UBC | SFU |
| Evaluation of universities | | | | | | |
| UBC/Doshisha | 3.90 _a (0.71) | 3.54 _b (0.67) | 4.16 _a (0.73) | 3.62 _b (0.77) | 4.46 _a (0.71) | 3.82 _b (0.73) |
| SFU/Ritsumeikan | 4.14 _a (0.62) | 3.38 _b (0.74) | 4.24 _a (0.77) | 4.00 _b (0.82) | 4.40 _a (0.73) | 4.14 _b (0.63) |
| Evaluation of independent student characteristics | | | | | | |
| UBC/Doshisha | 3.72 _a (0.52) | 3.55 _b (0.60) | 3.73 _a (0.73) | 3.37 _b (0.76) | 3.99 _a (0.72) | 3.84 _b (0.67) |
| SFU/Ritsumeikan | 3.54 _a (0.71) | 3.53 _a (0.71) | 3.33 _a (0.87) | 3.57 _b (0.88) | 3.68 _a (0.75) | 3.88 _b (0.72) |
| Evaluation of interdependent student characteristics | | | | | | |
| UBC/Doshisha | 3.33 _a (0.66) | 3.72 _b (0.56) | 3.77 _a (0.68) | 3.51 _b (0.66) | 3.83 _a (0.71) | 3.79 _a (0.68) |
| SFU/Ritsumeikan | 3.31 _a (0.62) | 3.65 _b (0.77) | 3.38 _a (0.75) | 3.58 _b (0.95) | 3.73 _a (0.71) | 3.80 _a (0.67) |

Note. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses. Within each target group and row, means with different subscripts are significantly different at $p < .05$. UBC = University of British Columbia; SFU = Simon Fraser University.

A highly significant School \times Target interaction emerged for the European Canadians for the independent traits, $F(1, 208) = 23.69, p < .001$. Simple effects analyses revealed that this interaction was due to UBC students rating UBC students more positively than they rated SFU students, $F(1, 102) = 7.91, p < .01$, and SFU students rating SFU students more positively than they rated UBC students, $F(1, 106) = 16.84, p < .001$. That is, the two European Canadian samples exhibited strong USBs for the independent traits.

The Asian Canadians also exhibited a significant School \times Target interaction, $F(1, 101) = 15.90, p < .001$. Simple effects analyses revealed that, as with the European Canadians, this interaction was due to UBC students rating UBC students more positively than they rated SFU students, $F(1, 56) = 11.91, p < .01$, and SFU students rating SFU students more positively than they rated UBC students, $F(1, 45) = 5.28, p < .05$. Asian Canadians thus also exhibited strong USBs for the independent traits.

Interdependent trait evaluations. Identical analyses were conducted for the interdependent traits. The three-way (Culture \times School \times Target) interaction was again significant, $F(2, 526) = 4.88, p < .01$. Follow-up analyses for the Japanese again revealed an absence of a significant School \times Target interaction ($F < 1$). Japanese did not show either USBs or university-effacing biases for the interdependent traits. Simple effects analyses by school revealed, interestingly, that students from both Doshisha, $F(1, 82) = 17.46, p < .001$, and Ritsumeikan, $F(1, 137) = 30.80, p < .001$, were in agreement in terms of rating Ritsumeikan students more positively than Doshisha students. Despite the consensus that Doshisha is a better school than

Ritsumeikan, students from both schools viewed Ritsumeikan students more positively than Doshisha students with respect to the interdependent traits.

Unlike in the analyses for the university evaluations and for the independent traits, the School \times Target interaction was not significant for the European Canadian sample for the interdependent traits, $F(1, 208) = 1.76, n.s.$ Simple effects analyses revealed that neither school exhibited significant differences in the evaluations of students for the interdependent traits. This anomalous finding was unexpected, standing as the only instance in either Study 1 or Study 2 in which European Canadians did not demonstrate group-serving tendencies.

In contrast to the European Canadians, the Asian Canadians did exhibit a significant School \times Target interaction, $F(1, 99) = 11.15, p < .01$. Simple effects analyses revealed that this interaction was due to UBC students rating UBC students more positively than they rated SFU students, $F(1, 54) = 9.58, p < .01$, and SFU students rating SFU students marginally more positively than they rated UBC students, $F(1, 45) = 3.13, p < .09$. Asian Canadians therefore demonstrated USBs for the interdependent traits.

Summary. In sum, aside from the one exception of European Canadians' evaluations of the interdependent traits, these results indicate that both groups of Canadians exhibited USBs when they evaluated their own universities and students from their universities. The tendencies to enhance the groups to which they belong are thus evident for both Asian Canadians and European Canadians. In contrast, Japanese students exhibited university-effacing biases when evaluating their own universities and no significant biases when evaluating students from their univer-

sities for either independent or interdependent traits. These data, then, provide no evidence that Japanese enhance the groups to which they belong. This pattern of results goes directly against the differences-in-content view that Japanese enhance themselves through their groups. Unlike in Study 1, no clear pattern was observed across the samples with respect to participants' evaluations of the independent and interdependent traits. Perhaps our earlier speculation that the less tangible interdependent traits lend themselves to greater self-enhancement applies only when participants are evaluating the percentage of the population that is better than they. When participants are specifically evaluating two targets, their own and their rival university, the magnitude of the bias may not hinge on the tangibility of the traits.

Between-Culture Comparisons of USE Subscales

The four subscales of the modified CSE Scale showed good reliability (Cronbach's alphas ranged from .82 to .86), especially given that each subscale is composed of only four items. The items on the USE subscales thus hung together well, despite our alterations from the generic target of participants' social groups to the specific target of participants' universities.

Between-culture comparisons revealed significant differences for three of the four subscales. Replicating the results of Study 1, a highly significant main effect for culture emerged for Membership USE, $F(2, 576) = 123.52, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that European Canadians scored significantly higher than both Asian Canadians and Japanese, and Asian Canadians were significantly higher on this measure than Japanese (see Table 4). That is, both Canadian samples viewed themselves to be more valuable members of their universities than Japanese, and Asian Canadians fell in between European Canadians and Japanese. Again, given the high correlation between Membership CSE and global self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), this effect likely reflects cultural differences in individual self-esteem (e.g., Bond & Cheung, 1983; Campbell et al., 1996).

Also replicating results of Study 1, a significant main effect for culture emerged with respect to Public USE, $F(2, 577) = 50.16, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that European Canadians had significantly higher Public USE scores than both Asian Canadians and Japanese, and Asian Canadians scored significantly higher than Japanese. European Canadians felt that others evaluated their university more positively than did Japa-

nese, and Asian Canadians fell in between. This latter finding further supports the notion that Westerners have more positive views of their groups than do Japanese.³

Again replicating Study 1 results, there was no cultural difference with respect to the Identity USE subscale, $F(2, 576) = 2.22, p > .10$. Canadians and Japanese did not differ with respect to the degree to which they reported that their universities influence their individual identities.⁴

Finally, unlike in Study 1, a significant main effect for culture emerged for Private USE, $F(2, 579) = 19.79, p < .001$. Tukey's HSD comparisons revealed that European Canadians felt more satisfied with belonging to their universities than did either Asian Canadians or Japanese, and Asian Canadians scored nominally higher than Japanese.

Additional Items

Analyses were conducted on the final three items of the questionnaire. The first item ("I know students from [name of rival university] very well") was included as a covariate for all analyses. We speculated that the magnitude of USBs might be affected by how well participants knew students from their rival schools. Analyses of covariance revealed, however, that this variable did not interact with any of the results.

ANOVAs were conducted for the item "Overall, I think that [UBC/Doshisha] is a better school to go to than [SFU/Ritsumeikan]." A significant Culture \times School interaction emerged, $F(2, 532) = 8.76, p < .001$. Simple effects analyses revealed that this interaction was due to the fact that although all three cultural groups exhibited some USBs (e.g., students from UBC and Doshisha agreed with this item more than students from SFU and Ritsumeikan), the discrepancy between European Canadians from UBC and from SFU ($M_s = 3.8$ and 2.4 , respectively), $F(1, 212) = 98.92, p < .001$, was larger than the discrepancy between Japanese from Doshisha and from Ritsumeikan ($M_s = 3.5$ and 3.0 , respectively), $F(1, 225) = 11.45, p < .001$. The discrepancy between Asian Canadians from UBC and from SFU ($M_s = 3.6$ and 2.6 , respectively), $F(1, 103) = 30.13, p < .001$, fell between the other two cultural groups.

The final item, "I think that most [UBC/Doshisha] students are glad that they went to [UBC/Doshisha] instead of [SFU/Ritsumeikan]," also revealed a significant Culture \times School interaction, $F(2, 532) = 7.11, p < .001$. European Canadians clearly showed evidence of a USB, as students from UBC endorsed this item ($M = 3.7$) to a greater extent than students from SFU ($M = 3.2$), $F(1, 212) = 13.06, p < .001$. In contrast, Japanese showed a slight university-effacing bias, as students from Doshisha ($M = 3.1$) endorsed this item marginally less than students from Ritsumeikan ($M = 3.4$), $F(1, 225) = 3.27, p < .08$. Asian Canadians again fell between, showing neither a USB nor a university-effacing bias ($M_s = 3.5$ and 3.3 for

Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations for University Self-Esteem
Subscale Scores in Study 2

| Measure | Japanese | | Asian Canadians | | European Canadians | |
|------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Membership | 10.8 _a | 3.05 | 13.6 _b | 3.05 | 15.1 _c | 2.53 |
| Private | 14.4 _a | 3.19 | 15.2 _a | 2.93 | 16.2 _b | 2.54 |
| Public | 14.6 _a | 2.49 | 15.9 _b | 2.00 | 16.8 _c | 1.99 |
| Identity | 12.0 _a | 3.53 | 12.5 _a | 3.34 | 11.7 _a | 3.30 |

Note. Within each row, means with different subscripts are significantly different at $p < .001$.

³ A main effect for gender emerged for Public CSE, in which women ($M = 16.1$) scored higher than men ($M = 15.4$), $F(1, 577) = 10.09, p < .01$.

⁴ A significant correlation emerged between age and Identity USE both for the Japanese ($r = -.15$) and for the European Canadian sample ($r = -.14$; both $p_s < .05$). Controlling for age by means of an analysis of covariance did not affect the magnitude of the cross-cultural difference.

UBC and SFU students, respectively), $F(1, 103) < 1$. These final two items provide additional evidence that positively biased views of one's university are more pronounced among European Canadians than Japanese, with Asian Canadians falling in the middle. That cultural differences in USBs were replicated when we used measures distinct from the university- and student-evaluation measures increases our confidence that group-serving biases are not as common among Japanese as among Canadians.

Taken together, cross-cultural comparisons of the dependent measures in Study 2 demonstrate that aside from the one exception of European Canadians' evaluations for the interdependent traits, both groups of Canadians exhibited stronger university-serving tendencies than Japanese. In fact, in a couple of instances, Japanese demonstrated university-effacing responses. Clearly this pattern of results is at odds with the notion that Japanese enhance themselves by evaluating their groups in unrealistically positive terms. When evaluating their universities, Japanese demonstrate a lack of enhancement similar to when they evaluate themselves. Cultural differences in self-enhancement appear to have little to do with whether the target is an individual or a group.

General Discussion

The results of both studies support the differences-in-process view of cultural differences in self-enhancement. The Japanese consistently exhibited weaker group-serving biases than did both groups of Canadians, and occasionally Japanese were actually group effacing. No evidence suggested that Japanese compensate for a lack of individual self-enhancement by enhancing their groups more than (or even as much as) Canadians. Aside from the exception that European Canadians did not show university enhancement for interdependent traits, both groups of Canadians enhanced both their family members and their universities more than the Japanese, for both independent and interdependent traits. Moreover, both groups of Canadians had higher Public CSE scores than the Japanese across both studies. Cultural differences in self-enhancement that have been found in previous research (e.g., Heine & Lehman, 1995a, 1997b; Markus & Kitayama, 1991a) do not appear simply to be a function of differences in the target of evaluation. They appear to reflect general differences in tendencies to enhance aspects of the self.

In short, we found that cultural differences in SSBs are paralleled by differences in group-serving biases. This suggests the possibility that motivations for enhancing one's self and for enhancing one's group are similar. This possibility is in line with other research that shows how both group enhancement and other-group derogation serve to enhance the self (e.g., Brown et al., 1988; Lemyre & Smith, 1985; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). It appears that self-enhancement, regardless of whether the characteristics that are enhanced relate to one's groups or one's internal attributes, is fostered in North American culture more so than it is in Japan.

This link between self-enhancement and group enhancement was also supported by the pattern of correlations between the FSBs and the other dependent variables in Study 1. European Canadians appear to enhance themselves indirectly when they enhance their evaluations of their family members. Their FSBs were related to how close they felt to their family members, their self-esteem, and their tendencies toward self-enhancement.

It seems as though European Canadians bask in the reflected glory of their family members (Cialdini et al., 1976). Saying, for example, that their mom is better than most others on a variety of traits apparently makes European Canadians feel better about themselves. That the Japanese group did not demonstrate much evidence for this "reflected enhancement" suggests a relative absence in their motivations for self-enhancement. Positive assessments of their family members had little relation to their own evaluations and thus do not seem to be grounded in motivations to indirectly enhance themselves.

Moreover, the frequent findings that Asian Canadians exhibited group-serving biases and Public CSE scores intermediate to European Canadian and Japanese participants' biases and scores underscores the role of culture in evaluations of one's group. The present studies provide evidence that group-serving biases appear to become more pronounced alongside exposure to Western culture (see also Heine & Lehman, 1997c). This finding suggests that Western culture provides a relatively greater emphasis to view oneself and one's groups positively (Heine & Lehman, 1995a, 1997b; Kitayama et al., 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991b).

The Cultural Construction of Self-Enhancement

These results add to the growing body of literature indicating that self-enhancing tendencies appear for the most part to be absent in the Japanese motivational repertoire. We suggest that whereas North Americans are better able to achieve the cultural ideals associated with independence and individualism by viewing themselves positively, the culturally mandated task of achieving interdependence for Japanese is not aided by self-enhancing thoughts. The Japanese cultural environment does not appear to nourish such unrealistic self-assessments.

To the contrary, a burgeoning literature suggests that Japanese culture encourages individuals to maintain a self-critical view of themselves (e.g., Heine & Lehman, 1997b; Kitayama et al., 1997; Takata, 1987). Individuals in collectivistic societies are not in a strong position to determine for themselves whether they are succeeding—they must endeavor for *others* to be satisfied with their performances (e.g., Roland, 1988; Spence, 1985). Succeeding in Japanese culture thus requires individuals to be aware of the consensually defined standards of excellence within a given context. Japanese must critically assess themselves to determine how they fall short of the consensual expectations and then seek to eliminate the perceived deficits. It is crucial for Japanese to develop the skills to attend to, and elaborate on, their shortcomings with respect to the pertinent social standards. Information indicating how one has fallen short of the consensual standards is used to improve one's actions and behaviors, to affirm one's sense of belongingness, and to promote harmony within the group (Heine & Lehman, 1997b; Kitayama et al., 1997; Markus et al., 1996).

Reflecting this habitual self-critical orientation are the various interpersonal scripts that get played out in everyday life in Japan whereby people communicate their personal inadequacies and limitations (Marsella, Walker, & Johnson, 1973). Examples of such processes are *amae* (the notion that one indulges one's sense of dependency on others; Doi, 1973), an emphasis on shame (Benedict, 1946; Lebra, 1983), the widespread occurrence of apologies in Japan (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990), and

the emphasis on self-criticism that is encouraged in the child-rearing process (White & Levine, 1986). Clearly, such an outlook is at odds with the well-documented self-enhancing tendencies of North Americans. The results of the present investigations suggest that this self-critical orientation may extend to encompass one's groups as well (for a more detailed discussion of self-criticism and Japanese, see Heine & Lehman, 1997b; Heine et al., 1997; Kitayama et al., 1997; Markus et al., 1996).

We are not suggesting that Japanese are not proud of, or happy with, being associated with a positively viewed group. This is a critical distinction to make. We would not question that the typical Tokyo University student is very proud of being a member of the top-ranked school in Japan. Similarly, the immense popularity among Japanese of Los Angeles Dodger Hideo Nomo, winner of the 1995 National League Rookie of the Year Award in major league baseball, demonstrates clearly that Japanese enjoy having a member of their group viewed favorably. However, our data reveal that Japanese do not hold unrealistically positive appraisals of their groups. They do not distort the positivity of their groups or of their selves. Although we have no objective benchmarks in the present studies with which to measure just how biased a given individual's responses are, we speculate that Japanese responses are based more on how others view themselves and their groups than on how they ideally would like to be viewed. Success in Japanese society requires individuals to gain an accurate understanding of how others view them (Heine et al., 1997; Spence, 1985).

Limitations and Future Directions

Some readers may be concerned that because Japanese culture values modesty (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991b) the cultural differences found in the present studies might be due merely to Japanese exhibiting modest response styles in their questionnaire answers. Indeed, one characteristic frequently attributed to Japanese is the great distinction they make between their public presentation (*tatemae*) and their private feelings (*honne*; Doi, 1986; Johnson, 1993; Lebra, 1976). It is conceivable that this distinction is such an integral part of Japanese life that individuals are reluctant to express their true private thoughts, even anonymously in questionnaires. That is, perhaps privately Japanese are as self-enhancing as North Americans but are reluctant to express such thoughts in psychological studies because of concerns regarding impression management.

This alternative account hinges on the notion that Japanese disguise their responses in psychological studies in a modest direction to a greater extent than do people from Western cultures. However, we know of no empirical evidence to support this account, and in fact, there is a growing body of evidence challenging it. For example, Kitayama et al. (1997) found no differences in Japanese' tendencies to interpret daily situations in terms of self-criticism when they were evaluating the typical undergraduate compared with when they were evaluating themselves. That is, there was no evidence that self-evaluations were colored by impression management. Comparisons of impression management response sets between Japanese (and Asians more generally) and European Canadians have similarly revealed no cultural differences (Heine & Lehman, 1995b; Lai & Linden, 1993). Moreover, other studies have revealed that the pattern of responses in cross-cultural studies of self-esteem and self-

enhancement is not consistent with modest response set interpretations (Diener, Suh, Smith, & Shao, 1995; Heine & Lehman, 1995a). Most compelling, however, are studies using either hidden behavioral or unobtrusive measures that have revealed, respectively, self-effacing tendencies (Heine, 1996; Takata, 1987) and an absence of dissonance-reducing self-affirmational tendencies (Heine & Lehman, 1997a) among Japanese in conditions in which they had no opportunity to "correct" their public presentation. Results of these studies are consistent with the notion that Japanese do not just say that they are no better than average; they truly seem to believe it.

Our investigations of group-serving biases were limited to only two categories: one's closest family member and one's university. Although Canadians clearly were more group-serving than Japanese with respect to both of these categories, it is possible that a different pattern would emerge with different target groups. Perhaps certain elements of groups that are absent in families and universities may elicit more pronounced group-serving biases in Japanese. For example, groups that are based solely on voluntary membership (such as groups of friends), groups that work toward a similar goal (such as companies and sports teams), and groups at a larger level (such as one's country) might elicit stronger group-serving effects in Japanese, than would families or universities. However, we know of no research linking such elements of groups to stronger group pride among Japanese, and we can think of no reason to believe that these elements would affect Japanese more than Canadians. More important, that European Canadians had significantly higher public collective self-esteem than Japanese with the generic target "my social group" casts doubt on the notion that a different pattern of results would be obtained had we selected different groups to investigate.

A second potential limitation is that asking Japanese to evaluate a family member and their university on the basis of internal attributes might itself be an imposed *etic*. The identity of the interdependent self is anchored more in its relationships with others than in its internal attributes (Hamaguchi, 1985; Markus & Kitayama, 1991b). This suggests that to the extent that enhancement biases are present in the Japanese motivational repertoire, Japanese would be most likely to enhance when evaluating the quality of their relationships relative to others (Endo, 1996). We are currently investigating this possibility.

Targeting groups for evaluation instead of individuals has been an important step toward realizing methodologies for understanding the nature of the interdependent view of self. In many respects, though, we are still relying on Western methodologies, and the risk of results obscured by imposed *etics* is still present. That the identity of the interdependent self is typically described as being defined by the situation and by the individual's relationships (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991b) suggests that the methodologies we use should similarly be sensitive to these issues. It remains a challenge for researchers to develop new, indigenous measures and methodologies to provide an understanding of the Eastern view of self that is not distorted by our Western lenses (cf. Chinese Culture Connection, 1987). Future research, preferably conducted by (or in collaboration with) Asian investigators, holds the promise of leading to the development and use of more interdependently oriented methodologies toward this end.

References

- Barnlund, D. C., & Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies: Japanese and American styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 193-206.
- Benedict, R. (1946). *The chrysanthemum and the sword*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Berry, J. (1969). On cross-cultural comparability. *International Journal of Psychology*, 4, 119-128.
- Blaine, B., & Crocker, J. (1993). Self-esteem and self-serving biases in reaction to positive and negative events: An integrative review. In R. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard* (pp. 55-85). New York: Plenum Press.
- Bond, M. H., & Cheung, T. (1983). College students' spontaneous self-concept. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 14, 153-171.
- Bond, M. H., Hewstone, M., Wan, K.-C., & Chiu, C.-K. (1985). Group-serving attributions across intergroup contexts: Cultural differences in the explanation of sex-typed behaviors. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 435-451.
- Brown, J. D. (1986). Evaluations of self and others: Self-enhancement biases in social judgments. *Social Cognition*, 4, 353-376.
- Brown, J. D., Collins, R. L., & Schmidt, G. W. (1988). Self-esteem and direct versus indirect forms of self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 445-453.
- Campbell, J. D. (1986). Similarity and uniqueness: The effects of attribute type, relevance, and individual differences in self-esteem and depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 281-294.
- Campbell, J. D., Trapnell, P., Heine, S. J., Katz, I. M., Lavalley, L. F., & Lehman, D. R. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 141-156.
- Chen, C., Lee, S.-Y., & 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.
- Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18, 143-164.
- Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 366-375.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Richardson, K. D. (1980). Two indirect tactics of image management: Basking and blasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 406-415.
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 503-513.
- Crocker, J., Thompson, L. L., McGraw, K. M., & Ingerman, C. (1987). Downward comparison, prejudice, and evaluations of others: Effects of self-esteem and threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 907-916.
- De Vos, G. A. (1973). *Socialization for achievement: Essays on the cultural psychology of the Japanese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Smith, H., & Shao, L. (1995). National differences in reported subjective well-being: Why do they occur? *Social Indicators Research*, 34, 7-32.
- Doi, T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Doi, T. (1986). *The anatomy of self*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Dunning, D., Meyerowitz, J. A., & Holzberg, A. D. (1989). Ambiguity and self-evaluation: The role of idiosyncratic trait definitions in self-serving assessments of ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1082-1090.
- Endo, Y. (1996, August). *Us-serving biases and self-effacement in close relationships*. Paper presented at the 60th Annual Conference of the Japanese Psychological Association, Tokyo.
- Felson, R. B. (1981). Ambiguity and bias in the self-concept. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44, 64-69.
- Fincham, F. D., Beach, S. R., & Baucom, D. H. (1987). Attribution processes in distressed and nondistressed couples: 4. Self-partner attribution differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 739-748.
- Fiske, A., Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Nisbett, R. E. (in press). The cultural matrix of social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fletcher, G. J. O., & Ward, C. (1988). Attribution theory and processes. A cross-cultural perspective. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology* (pp. 230-244). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Forsyth, D. R., & Schlenker, B. R. (1977). Attributing the causes of group performance: Effects of performance quality, task importance, and future testing. *Journal of Personality*, 45, 220-236.
- Greenfield, P. M. (in press). Culture as process: Empirical methodology for cultural psychology. In J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga, & J. Pandey (Eds.), *Theory and method: Vol. 1. Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American Psychologist*, 35, 603-618.
- Hamaguchi, E. (1985). A contextual model of the Japanese: Toward a methodological innovation in Japan studies. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 11, 289-321.
- Heine, S. J. (1996). *Culture and the need for positive self-regard: The Japanese case*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1995a). Cultural variation in unrealistic optimism: Does the West feel more invulnerable than the East? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 595-607.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1995b). Social desirability among Canadian and Japanese students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 777-779.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1996). Hindsight bias: A cross-cultural analysis. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 317-323.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997a). Culture, dissonance, and self-affirmation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 389-400.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997b). *Culture, self-discrepancies, and self-satisfaction*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997c). *Move the body, change the self: Acculturative effects on the self-concept*. Manuscript in preparation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R., Kitayama, S., & Markus, H. R. (1997). *Culture and the need for positive self-regard*. Manuscript in preparation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Hewstone, M., Bond, M. H., & Wan, K.-C. (1983). Social facts and social attributions: The explanation of intergroup differences in Hong Kong. *Social Cognition*, 2, 142-157.
- Hewstone, M., & Ward, C. (1985). Ethnocentrism and causal attribution in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 614-623.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1985). Measurement in cross-cultural psychology: A review and comparison of strategies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16, 131-152.
- James, W. (1950). *The principles of psychology*. New York: Dover. (Original work published in 1890)
- Johnson, F. A. (1993). *Dependency and Japanese socialization*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Lieberman, C. (1995). The collective

- construction of self-esteem: Implications for culture, self, and emotion. In J. Russell, J. Wellenkamp, T. Manstead, & J. M. F. Dols (Eds.), *Everyday conceptions of emotions* (pp. 523-550). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes of self-esteem management: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-depreciation in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1245-1267.
- Kitayama, S., Palm, R. I., Masuda, T., Karasawa, M., & Carroll, J. (1996). *Optimism in the U.S. and pessimism in Japan: Perceptions of earthquake risk*. Unpublished manuscript, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.
- Kitayama, S., Takagi, H., & Matsumoto, H. (1995). Causal attribution of success and failure: Cultural psychology of the Japanese self. *Japanese Psychological Review*, 38, 247-280.
- Kondo, D. K. (1987). Creating an ideal self: Theories of selfhood and pedagogy at a Japanese ethics retreat. *Ethos*, 15, 241-272.
- Lai, J., & Linden, W. (1993). The smile of Asia: Acculturation effects on symptom reporting. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 25, 303-313.
- Lau, R. R., & Russell, D. (1980). Attributions in the sports pages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 29-38.
- Lebra, T. S. (1976). *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Lebra, T. S. (1983). Shame and guilt: A psychocultural view of the Japanese self. *Ethos*, 11, 192-209.
- Lemyre, L., & Smith, P. M. (1985). Intergroup discrimination and self-esteem in the minimal group paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 660-670.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 302-318.
- Maclean's. (1994, November 14). Measuring excellence, pp. 16-39.
- Mahler, I. (1976). What is the self concept in Japan? *Psychologia*, 19, 127-132.
- Marks, G. (1984). Thinking one's abilities are unique and one's opinions are common. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 203-208.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991a). Cultural variation in the self concept. In G. R. Goethals & J. Strauss (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on the self* (pp. 18-48). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991b). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S., & Heiman, R. J. (1996). Culture and "basic" psychological principles. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*. (pp. 857-913) New York: Guilford Press.
- Marsella, A. J., Walker, E., & Johnson, F. (1973). Personality correlates of depressive disorders in female students of different ethnic groups. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 19, 77-81.
- Muramoto, Y., & Yamaguchi, S. (1997). *Another type of self-serving bias: Coexistence of self-effacing and group-serving tendencies in attribution in the Japanese culture*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Muramoto, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Kosaka, A., & Yu, S.-Y. (1997). *Perception of self-effacing and group-serving attributions: A cross-cultural study*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Nakamura, H. (1964). *Ways of thinking of Eastern peoples*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Perloff, L. S., & Fetzer, B. K. (1986). Self-other judgments and perceived vulnerability to victimization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 502-510.
- Roland, A. (1988). *In search of self in India and Japan*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shweder, R. A., & Bourne, E. J. (1984). Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp. 158-199). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Snyder, C. R., Lassegard, M., & Ford, C. E. (1986). Distancing after group success and failure: Basking in reflected glory and cutting off reflected failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 382-388.
- Spence, J. T. (1985). Achievement American style: The rewards and costs of individualism. *American Psychologist*, 40, 1285-1295.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Takata, T. (1987). Self-deprecatory tendencies in self evaluation through social comparison. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 27(1), 27-36.
- Taylor, D. M., & Jaggi, V. (1974). Ethnocentrism and causal attribution in a South Indian context. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 5, 162-171.
- 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., & Mettee, D. R. (1971). When similarity breeds contempt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 20, 75-81.
- Triandis, H. C. (1978). Some universals of social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 4, 1-16.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.
- Weinstein, N. D. (1980). Unrealistic optimism about future life events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 806-820.
- White, M. I., & LeVine, R. A. (1986). What is an "Ii ko" (good child)? In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 55-62). New York: Freeman.
- Zuckerman, M. (1979). Attribution of success and failure revisited: or The motivational bias is alive and well in attribution theory. *Journal of Personality*, 47, 245-287.

Appendix

Characteristics of Universities and Students

University Characteristics

1. University X has an excellent reputation among [Canadian/Japanese] universities.
2. University X graduates tend to enter the upper ranks of society.
3. University X has top-notch facilities.
4. University X graduates tend to get good jobs.
5. University X provides a high quality education.

Student Characteristics

Independent Characteristics

1. University X students are quite interesting people.
2. University X students are very creative.

3. University X students are highly intelligent.
4. University X students are quite physically attractive.
5. University X students are athletic.

Interdependent Characteristics

1. University X students are very loyal to their school.
2. University X students are considerate.
3. University X students are particularly hard-working.
4. University X students are very easy to get along with.
5. University X students are cooperative.

Received May 16, 1996

Revision received September 13, 1996

Accepted September 24, 1996 ■