

Does Self-Enhancement Exist in Differently Construed Selves? A Test of the Current  
Debate between the Process and the Content View.

Thesis submitted to  
the institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences  
in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

Bogazici University Library



39001102162412

14

by

Berna Gerçek

Boğaziçi University

2004

*to Bernadin*  
*for everything he did for me*

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude for the members of my thesis committee for their support in my thesis. I was very fortunate to experience endless support, inspiration, and encouragement of Assistant Professor Bilge Ataca through every step of the preparation of this thesis. Her contribution to this thesis from the most technical details to the theoretical vision is immeasurable. She devoted hours and shared her knowledge generously, and the mere opportunity of observing her academic skills contributed to the development of my research conducting capabilities. Above all, I am deeply indebted to her for introducing me with topics which I want to spend my research career on, and for shaping my academic aspirations.

Professor Diane Sunar shared her wisdom, constructive criticisms and helpful suggestions when they were most needed. She has inspired critical thinking not only about my thesis project, but also about my vision of whole psychology during my graduate and undergraduate years. Professor Hamit Fişek provided invaluable statistical guidance and answered even the most impractical questions of me patiently, with his generous attitude. It was a privilege and honor for me having them as committee members.

I would also like to use this opportunity to thank Associate Professor Ercan Alp for his confidence in me as a research assistant when I was only a freshman, and without whom I could not realize I had such an enthusiasm through research within me.

I would like to thank Göklem Tekdemir, Emre Güranlı, and Nermin Mutlu for sharing their interest and enabling my access with different universities. I also thank Dr. Sibel Arkonaç, Dr. Lale Şahlan, and Dr. Meltem Narter from İstanbul University; Muzaffer Erdoğan, Dr. Uğur Müngen, Dr. Meltem Güngörmez, Dr. Ülkü Uzunçarşılı,

Dr. Okan Sirkeciođlu, and Dr. Hakkı Tuncay Özer, from İstanbul Technical University; Sinan Akyürek, and Rıza Gerçek from İ. U. Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Medicine; Bülent Kılıç, Dr. Betül Aydın, Dr. Canan Savran, Dr. Halil Ekşi, and Dr. Ahmet Şirin from Marmara University for their help in distribution of the questionnaires.

I want to express my heartfelt thanks to three special people without whom I could not make through the year: Özge Gürcanlı was always *there*, she became my *common-sense* when things fall apart, and made the world a beautiful place with her mere existence. To know that *we will survive* makes me feel that *I will survive*. Burcu Sancar; thank you for coming back to my life when you were most needed and *growing up* with me. She shared the fate of writing a thesis, and provided everything a graduate student needs: inspiration, stimulation, hours of discussions through nights of insomnia, and companionship. Gül Yüksel endured the *most long lasting relationship* history has ever witnessed with the most difficult person nationwide, excepted my eternal thesis struggle as a third roommate as if *I were* not enough, and filled my last seven years with genuine trust and friendship. Thanks also to Deniz and Müjde for their precious support, and Hüseyin, Friederike and Güneş for “*Wednesday-pizzeria*”s, and everything they did.

I would like to thank my brother Bernadin Gerçek and my cousin Bahaddin Sevcan for their assistance in imprinting and transportation of the materials. I am deeply indebted to my brother Bernadin, since he provided me with an amazing haste with brand-new computers when my computer crushed twice during data analyzing. Last but not least, without the financial and emotional support, and above all, the endless trust and confidence of my parents Müjgan Gerçek and Hilmi Gerçek, I could not write this thesis. Wherever I may roam, whoever I may become, I will always feel that the most honorable and wonderful thing for me is being their daughter.

## Abstract

### Does Self-Enhancement Exist in Differently Construed Selves? A Test of the Current Debate between the Process and the Content View.

by Berna Gerçek

The aim of the present study was to compare the predictions of “culture as a process” (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999) and “culture as a content” view (Kurman, 2001) by examining the effects of the relational, individual, and collective self-construals, and the effects of abstract and context-specific self-definitions on self-enhancement. Four-hundred and thirty-five university students in İstanbul, Turkey, filled out inventories of above-average effect, consisting of trait adjectives that are differentially desirable for the three self-construals, both in abstract and context-specific forms. In line with the predictions of the culture as a content view, results revealed boosting effects of each self-construal on self-enhancement for corresponding abstract traits. However, in line with the predictions of the culture as a process view, individual self-construal was a more consistent predictor of self-enhancement across different traits. Self-enhancement on abstract and context-specific traits did not differ for those high on individual and those high on collective self-construal; both groups self-enhanced greater on context-specific traits than on abstract traits. Overall, results showed that self-enhancement is a basic tendency that exists in differently construed selves.

## Özet

Benlik Güçlendirme Yanlılığı Değişik Benlik Kurgularında Mevcut Mudur? Kültürü

Süreç ve İçerik Olarak Algılayan Görüşlerin Karşılaştırılması.

Berna Gerçek

Bu çalışmada, kültürü süreç (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999) ve içerik (Kurman, 2001) olarak algılayan görüşlerin karşılaştırılması amaçlanmaktadır. İlişkisel, bireyci ve toplulukçu benliklerin benlik güçlendirme yanlılığı üzerindeki etkisi, soyut ve bağlam bağımlı kişilik tanımları göz önünde bulundurularak araştırılmıştır. İstanbul'daki çeşitli üniversitelerde eğitim gören dört yüz otuz beş katılımcı, her benlik için farklı arzu edilirlilik seviyesindeki kişilik sıfatlarından oluşan, soyut ve bağlam-bağımlı benlik güçlendirme yanlılığı ölçeklerini doldurmuştur. Kültürü içerik olarak algılayan görüşü destekleyecek şekilde, farklı benliklerin kendisine tekabül eden soyut sıfatlarda benlik güçlendirme yanlılığını arttırdığı gözlenmiştir. Bireyci benliğin her üç sıfat gurubu için benlik güçlendirme yanlılığını arttırdığı bulunmuştur; ki bu bulgu, kültürü süreç olarak algılayan görüşü desteklemektedir. Soyut ve bağlam bağımlı benlik güçlendirme yanlılığı bireyci ve toplulukçu benliğe sahip katılımcılarda fark etmemiş; her iki grup, bağlam-bağımlı sıfatlarda soyut sıfatlardan daha fazla benlik güçlendirme yanlılığı göstermiştir. Genel olarak sonuçlar, benlik güçlendirme yanlılığının değişik benlik kurgularında yer alan temel bir eğilim olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

## Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Theoretical Explanations for the Cross-Cultural Differences in Self-Enhancement.....	4
Context Specificity of the Interdependent Self.....	10
The Present Study.....	17
Hypotheses.....	19
Method.....	20
Participants.....	20
Instrument.....	20
Self-Construal.....	20
Self-Enhancement.....	21
Filler-Scale.....	23
Procedure.....	24
Pilot Study.....	24
Main Study.....	24
Results.....	26
Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables.....	26
Preliminary Analyses.....	28
Results Concerning the Hypotheses.....	31
The Relationship between Self-Construal Scores and Abstract Self- Enhancement on Relational, Individual, and Collective Traits.....	31

	Page
The Relationship between Self-Construal Scores and Abstract versus Context-Specific Self-Enhancement.....	37
Discussion.....	47
Limitations and Future Directions.....	53
Conclusion.....	55
References.....	57
Appendices.....	66
Appendix A: Instructions and Demographic Questions (Turkish).....	67
Appendix B: Relational, Individual, and Collective Self-Aspects Scale (Turkish).....	68
Appendix C: Inventory of Abstract Self-Enhancement (Turkish).....	70
Appendix D: Context Priming Exercise: Home (Turkish).....	71
Appendix E: Manipulation Check: Home (Turkish).....	72
Appendix F: Inventory of Context-Specific Self-Enhancement: Home (Turkish).....	73
Appendix G: Context-Priming Exercise: School (Turkish).....	74
Appendix H: Manipulation Check: School (Turkish).....	75
Appendix I: Inventory of Context-Specific Self-Enhancement: School (Turkish).....	76
Appendix J: Pilot Study.....	77
Appendix K: Adult Sources of Self-Esteem Inventory: Satisfaction Subscale (Turkish).....	94
Appendix L: Instructions and Demographic Questions (English).....	96

Appendix M: Relational, Individual, and Collective Self-Aspects Scale (English).....	97
Appendix N: Inventory of Abstract Self-Enhancement (English).....	99
Appendix O: Context Priming Exercise: Home (English).....	100
Appendix P: Manipulation Check: Home (English).....	101
Appendix Q: Inventory of Context-Specific Self-Enhancement: Home (English).....	102
Appendix R: Context-Priming Exercise: School (English).....	103
Appendix S: Manipulation Check: School (English).....	104
Appendix T: Inventory of Context-Specific Self-Enhancement: School (English).....	105
Appendix U: Adult Sources of Self-Esteem Inventory: Satisfaction Subscale (English).....	106

## List of Tables

	Page
Table 1. Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables.....	27
Table 2. Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Construals.....	28
Table 3. Summary of One-Sample $t$ Tests for Self-Enhancement Subscales.....	29
Table 4. Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Abstract Traits.....	30
Table 5. Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Overall Measures.....	31
Table 6. Intercorrelations among the Variables.....	32
Table 7. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Relational Abstract Self-Enhancement.....	34
Table 8. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Individual Abstract Self-Enhancement.....	35
Table 9. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Collective Abstract Self-Enhancement.....	36
Table 10. Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Overall Measures Averaged Across the Groups.....	38
Table 11. Means and Standard Deviations of Overall Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups.....	39
Table 12. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Overall Abstract Self-Enhancement.....	40
Table 13. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Overall Home-Context Self-Enhancement.....	41
Table 14. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Overall School-Context Self-Enhancement.....	41

Table 15. Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Relational Traits Averaged Across the Groups.....	43
Table 16. Means and Standard Deviations of Relational Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups.....	43
Table 17. Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Individual Traits Averaged Across the Groups.....	44
Table 18. Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups.....	45
Table 19. Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Collective Traits Averaged Across the Groups.....	46
Table 20. Means and Standard Deviations of Collective Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups.....	46
Table 21. Intercorrelations among the Relational Personality Characteristics and Self-Construal Scores.....	79
Table 22. Descriptive Characteristics of the Relational Items.....	80
Table 23. Intercorrelations among the Individual Personality Characteristics and Self-Construal Scores.....	81
Table 24. Descriptive Characteristics of the Individual Items.....	82
Table 25. Intercorrelations among the Collective Personality Characteristics and Self-Construal Scores.....	84
Table 26. Descriptive Characteristics of the Collective Items.....	85

## Introduction

Self-enhancement can generally be described as the tendency of individuals to enhance the positivity of their self-conceptions, and/or to protect their self-concept from negative information (Sedikides, 1993). Self-enhancement bias takes many forms, which can be measured in a number of ways. For example, many people possess unrealistic optimism about their future. People judge that they are more likely to encounter a positive event in the future than most of other people and a negative fate is less likely to fall on them than it falls on other people (Weinstein, 1980). The above average effect is the tendency of individuals to consider themselves better than similar others on certain traits, abilities, or behavioral characteristics. Since it is logically impossible for most of the members of a given population to be better than most other members, if it occurs, it is considered as a tendency of self-enhancement in that group. The above average effect is measured in two ways. In the first approach, participants are asked to rate their position relative to an average other on the same scale. Studies conducted in this paradigm consistently point to a self-enhancement tendency (e.g., Alicke, Klotz, Breitenbecher, Yurak, & Vredenburg, 1995; Dunning, Meyerowitz, & Holzberg, 1989). A second approach is to make respondents rate both themselves and other people comparable to themselves on certain characteristics. Here, the difference between own and other ratings are taken as an indication of self-enhancement. A pioneering study by Alicke (1985) indicates that people consistently evaluate themselves as possessing desirable characteristics more, and undesirable characteristics less than other people do. Using external criteria to measure this bias is also possible, like comparing ratings of oneself on academic ability with actual grade point average (e.g., Kurman 2001b), or

comparing peer with self ratings on several personality characteristics (e.g., Yik, Bond, & Paulhus, 1998).

Self-enhancement tendency is well documented in the West with a large variety of methods. For example, Brown (1986) showed that for his American college student sample, positively valenced attributes were considered more, whereas negatively valenced attributes less characteristic of the self than of the average college student. Likewise, in a series of studies, Sedikides (1993) found that American college students preferred more accurate information about their positive than their negative traits. Similarly, when people's beliefs about their future are examined, what is usually obtained is an unrealistic optimism bias for themselves (e.g., Regan, Snyder, & Kassin, 1995).

For a long time, self-enhancement has been assumed to be a universal tendency of humans, the proposed function of which is the promotion of mental health and adjustment for normal individuals by bolstering self-esteem (Taylor & Brown, 1988; for an opposed discussion see also Asendorpf & Ostendorf, 1998; Colvin, Block, & Funder, 1995). Studies that related high levels of self-esteem to the positivity of self-view compared to other people (Baumgardner, 1990; Brown, 1986; Pelham & Swann, 1989), and studies that related depression to lack of self-enhancement (Agostinelli, Sherman, Presson, & Chassin, 1992) both confirmed this point. However, recently, this universalistic stance towards self-enhancement has been challenged by cross-cultural research. Heine and Lehman (1995) showed that unlike European Canadians, Japanese did not show unrealistic optimism for future life events. Even when the rated life events were generated by Japanese and Canadians separately, and rated by the subjects for their importance (thus generating a meaningful index for collectivist and individualist events), Japanese did not show

unrealistic optimism for either type of events as much as the Canadians (Heine & Lehman, 1995, Study 2). Even when the referent is an imagined sibling rather than an average other, European Americans still show optimistic bias for future life events whereas the Japanese show a pessimistic bias (i.e., claiming that negative life events are more likely to happen to them than their siblings) (Chang & Asakawa, 2003).

Similarly, there is evidence that when introduced with hypothetical success scenarios, while Americans consider success situations as more relevant to their self-esteem than failure situations, Japanese consider failure situations more relevant to their self-esteem, which implies a self-critical attitude on the part of the Japanese (Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997). Heine, Takata, and Lehman (2000) designed a relevant study in which they randomly assigned their Canadian and Japanese participants to success or failure situations in a bogus computer task. The task consisted of several trials of a fake cognitive capacity task. After each trial the program provided participants with feedback comparing their responses with the "average college student". Participants were asked to make judgments about their performance after viewing enough trials. Results revealed that Canadians viewed more trials when they received failure feedback. Japanese on the other hand, viewed significantly more trials when the feedback indicated that they performed better than average, pointing to a self-critical attitude. Moreover, irrespective of the feedback they received, Canadians indicated that less than fifty percent of their classmates could outperform them in the task, whereas this was the case for Japanese only if they were in the success condition. In a similar design by Heine, Kitayama and Lehman (2001), when participants received success and failure feedbacks after completing the bogus task, it was observed that Canadians' ratings of their ability were unaffected by the feedback they received, whereas those of the

Japanese were affected. Moreover, Canadians engaged in high levels of self-enhancement on several personality traits unrelated to the task, irrespective of the feedback they received. On the other hand, Japanese did so only if they received positive feedback in the previous task (Heine et al., 2001).

The designs of Kitayama et al. (1997), and Heine et al. (2000, 2001) can be considered as indirect measures of self-enhancement tendency. A more direct technique is the measurement of better than average effect. Indeed, there are also examples in the literature using this technique, which shows greater self-enhancement in individualist than in collectivist societies. For example, Norasakkunkit and Kalick (2002) compared self-enhancement level of European Americans and Asians, asking participants to “estimate the percentage of population of the same age and sex that is better than they” (p. 61) on several personality traits. Not surprisingly, European Americans revealed higher levels of self-enhancement than Asians (Norasakkunkit & Kalick, 2002).

### Theoretical Explanations for the Cross-Cultural Differences in Self-Enhancement

Heine, Lehman, Markus and Kitayama (1999) explained the lack of self-enhancement motivation in Asian settings, especially in Japan, by referring to Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) conception of independent versus interdependent self-construals. Independent self-construal predominates in individualistic settings, where a unique, bounded self is promoted, and autonomy is highly encouraged. Behavior is assumed to be the consequence of the internal characteristics of the individual. To achieve the culturally shared goal of assertion and self-promotion, one is encouraged to see the self in positive regard. By enhancing positive internal

attributes, one comes closer to the cultural ideal of “a person of high self-esteem”.

As stated before, evidence indicating a positive relationship between self-esteem and self-enhancement is not rare in western settings (e.g., Baumgardner, 1990; Brown, 1986; Pelham & Swann, 1989).

On the contrary, the interdependent self that is prominent in collectivist settings is not as separated from the surrounding group as the independent self. Group harmony is encouraged, and self needs are expected to be sacrificed if they contradict group needs. Belonging to and serving better for the group require self-improvement, the attainment of which depends largely on constant self-monitoring and a self-critical attitude (Kitayama & Markus, 1999). There is evidence that Japanese are more persistent in problem solving after failure feedback, whereas North Americans are more persistent after positive feedback, which shows the self-improvement motive and self-critical attitude of the collectivists (Heine, Kitayama, Lehman, Takata, Ide, Leung, & Matsumoto, 2001). In a cultural setting where belonging to the group is the norm, a need for uniqueness should be very low; in fact the relationship between collectivism and a low need for uniqueness has been shown empirically (Yamaguchi, 1994; Yamaguchi, Kuhlman, & Sugimori, 1995). Hence, in Heine et al.'s (1999) view, culture is regarded as a process which shapes the psyche of individuals. Self-enhancement motivation, which does not exist in the collectivist meaning system, is lacking in the interdependent self.

On the other hand, evidence for self-enhancement in collectivistic contexts also exists. For example, there is evidence that when responding to a social desirability scale, Chinese participants reveal self-enhancement tendency instead of a modesty bias (Cuixia, Jian, & Zhongfang, 2003). Yik, Bond, and Paulhus (1998) documented self-enhancement tendency in a sample of Chinese university students,

using peer versus self rating paradigm. Participants, who worked together in an experimentally-set group task, rated both themselves and their task-mates on several personality dimensions (e.g., helpfulness, assertiveness, openness to experience) using the Sino-American Person Perception Scale (SAPPS) (Yik, & Bond, 1993). In this Chinese sample self-enhancement was especially evident in the openness to experience dimension. In another study in which Japanese, Asian American, and European American subjects rated themselves, their best friends, and the average other on several trait terms (e.g., competent, friendly) and general orientations toward life (e.g., enjoy life with regard to recreation). Self-enhancement, conceptualized as higher mean ratings of self than the average other, was found to be prevalent among all three groups (Brown & Kobayashi, 2002). The observation of self-enhancement tendency in collectivist settings led to another suggestion that motivation of self-enhancement is regarded as a universal phenomenon that is expressed in different ways in different cultural settings. Culture is considered as a content that determines the expression of universal tendencies (e.g., Kurman, 2001b). Concerning the better than average effect for instance, if trait adjectives used in self-enhancement research are differentiated according to their value for collectivist and individualist settings (e.g., *intelligence* for the independent, *agreeableness* for the collectivist), it is possible to observe self-enhancement more in the culturally meaningful traits in both groups. For example, individualist European New Zealanders and more collectivist Maori self-enhance in different traits, especially on traits that are rated important by each group (Harrington & Liu, 2002).

Kurman's (2001b) study provides persuasive evidence for the "culture as a content view". Kurman (2001b) compared three groups of students, Singaporean Chinese, Israeli Druze (an Arabic minority in Israeli), and Israeli Jews on academic

self-enhancement and the above average effect on two groups of personality traits (i.e., intelligence, health and sociability as agentic traits, cooperation, honesty, and generosity as communal traits). The results revealed that Singaporean Chinese who, were the lowest on individualism as a group, self-enhanced on communal traits more than on agentic traits. They also self-enhanced on agentic traits less than the Druze and the Jews did. In addition, the Singaporean Chinese group scored lower than the other two groups on academic self-enhancement, which can be considered as an agentic dimension. Moreover, the evaluation of the relationship between individual self-construal scores, modesty bias, and self-enhancement revealed that interdependent self-construal was not related to self-enhancement, but the lack of independent self-construal and presence of modesty bias were related to a lack of self-enhancement on agentic traits and academic self-enhancement. Another compelling evidence came from Sedikides, Toguchi and Gaertner (2003), who generated several behaviors as well as trait adjectives that were differentially meaningful for independent and interdependent self-construal. After a culture immersion exercise (imagining oneself in one's own cultural context), Japanese and American participants rated themselves relative to an imagined group member in an imagined group working setting on these behaviors and traits. Even though the overall level of self-enhancement was equal in both groups, each group self-enhanced more on culturally meaningful traits and behaviors than culturally less meaningful traits and behaviors. Moreover, each group self-enhanced on culturally meaningful traits and behaviors more than the other group did. In a replication of the design with only American participants grouped according to their self-construal scores as independent or interdependent, similar results were obtained (Sedikides et al., 2003, Study 2).

Other kinds of evidence counter-arguing Heine et al.'s (1999) proposal that self-enhancement is lacking for interdependent self construal, should also be mentioned. For instance, there is evidence that what is responsible for the lack of self-enhancement is not interdependence per se, but the existence of vertical collectivism and modesty bias (Kurman & Sriram, 2002). Again in another study conducted by Kurman (2001a), a lack of self-enhancement was associated with modesty bias, not with individualism-collectivism in Israeli subjects. It has also been shown that self-enhancement does not correlate negatively with constructive self-criticism (which is hypothesized to be related to self-improvement motive) either for the collectivist Japanese, or for the more individualist Israelis (Kurman, Yoshihara-Tanaka, & Elkoshi, 2003). If Heine et al.'s (1999) assumption that a lack of self-enhancement or even self-effacement is the result of interdependent self's self-improvement motive to better serve the group's needs is correct, then it would be difficult to explain Kurman et al.'s (2003) findings. Furthermore, studies employing implicit measures to assess self-enhancement reveal this tendency in eastern settings. For instance, Muramoto (2003) showed that although Japanese college students make external attributions (luck, chance, and environment) for their past successes more than their past failures, they indicate that their family and close friends would attribute their (the participants') successes to ability; hence they engage in indirect self-enhancement.

Research that relates psychological well-being to self-enhancement also has important implications for the issue of the universality of self-enhancement. Whether self-enhancement level is found to be lower for collectivists or equal for collectivist and individualist groups, a consistent finding is the similar relationship between self-enhancement and self-esteem: The higher the self-esteem, the more is

self-enhancement (Harrington & Liu, 2002; Kurman & Sriram, 1997; Kurman et al., 2003; Yik et al., 1998). In a replication of the previously mentioned study of Brown and Kobayashi (2002) with American and Japanese college students, Kobayashi and Brown (2003) not only showed similar levels of self-enhancement for the two samples, but also found similar relationships between self-esteem and self-enhancement. In the same way, higher levels of depression are associated with lower levels of self-enhancement for both collectivists and individualists (Hymes & Akiyama, 1991). These findings indicate similar psychological mechanisms underlying the motive of self-enhancement for different cultural contexts.

A series of studies conducted by Kurman (2003) illustrate this point clearly. Kurman (2003) compared different cultural groups (Singaporean Chinese and urban Israelis, Japanese and Israelis, and Israeli Jews and Israelis of Ethiopian origin) on a number of self-enhancement measures including the above-average effect and academic self-enhancement. Although self-enhancement was higher for the more individualist Israeli samples, higher levels of self-enhancement, positive affectivity, and emotional well-being were related to higher levels of self-enhancement for each subsample.

On the other hand, there are also contradictory findings to the “content” view of self-enhancement. For example, Heine and Lehman (1997) documented greater group-enhancement bias (university and family) on the part of European Canadians than in Asian Canadians and Japanese. If belonging to an in-group is a significant and meaningful motivation for the collectivists, then Asians would show equal or greater group enhancement than the European Canadians. Moreover, Norasakkunkit and Kalick’s (2002) study showed less self-enhancement on the part of Asians than the European Americans even though two groups of trait adjectives that were

differentially meaningful for interdependent and independent self-construals were used. In addition to this, in Yik, Bond, and Paulhus's (1998) study, Chinese subjects self-enhanced on the "openness to experience" dimension, which can be considered as an agentic dimension, but self-effaced on such characteristics as emotional stability and helpfulness, which are assumed to be important and meaningful in collectivist settings. In a comparable study using external criteria (peer ratings of personality characteristics), Japanese participants self-enhanced to a lesser degree than American participants. Interestingly however, whereas the self-enhancement level of Americans increased with the desirability of the rated characteristics, that of the Japanese decreased, indicating different mechanisms for the two groups (Heine & Renshaw, 2002).

#### Context Specificity of the Interdependent Self

A very important point seems to be rather overlooked in the debate of universality versus culture-specificity of self-enhancement bias. According to the theorizing of Markus and Kitayama (1991), the independent self is characterized by a set of fixed, unique internal attributes that constitute a bounded self-representation, relatively insensitive to context specific factors. The interdependent self, on the other hand, is more variant over time and context, flexible not only in terms of behavior but also in terms of self-representation, and quite responsive to social surrounding.

There is plenty of evidence confirming this argument. A pioneering study was conducted by Bond and Cheung (1983). They presented their American, Japanese, and Hong Kong Chinese participants with the Twenty Statements Test (TST; Kuhn & McPartland, 1954). The TST is an open ended questionnaire in

which the respondent is asked to complete twenty sentences starting with "I am". The results of Bond and Cheung's (1983) study is very interesting in showing that when defining themselves, Japanese participants referred to pure psychological attributes much less than American and Chinese participants did. Similarly, Cousins (1989) presented his Japanese and American participants with TST, and analyzed the responses according to a four category coding scheme: Physical responses (e.g., I am 18 years old), social responses (e.g., I am a college student), attributive responses (e.g., I am friendly), global responses (I am a human being). The analyses of the data revealed that Japanese participants mostly referred to physical self and social categories. Concerning the attributive responses, American participants mentioned pure psychological attributes more frequently than the Japanese, whereas the Japanese described themselves mostly in reference to preferences and social activities. Cousins (1989) also made his participants respond to a free-response questionnaire in which participants had to describe themselves in a context like school or home. The analyses of these contextualized responses also revealed significant results. Provided with a meaningful social context, Japanese responded with a greater number of pure psychological attributes than the Americans, who in turn responded more frequently with preferences and wishes than the Japanese.

In a more recent study conducted by Rhee, Uleman, Lee and Roman (1995) similar results emerged. Using a coding system based on Cousins (1989), Rhee et al. (1995) came up with four main dimensions (specific-abstract, and autonomous-social) composed of several sub-categories. Not surprisingly, Euro-Americans and unidentified Asian Americans (who did not identify with their ethnicity) used more abstract self descriptions than Koreans and doubly identified Asian Americans (who identified themselves both with their ethnicity and being American). Autonomous

self-descriptions also differed between the groups in a linear fashion in the expected direction. Moreover, abstract and autonomous responses, and specific and social responses were highly correlated in Euro American and unidentified Asian American groups. On the other hand, this correlation was significantly weaker in Koreans and doubly identified Asian Americans, which points to the cultural differences in the self description.

Another manifestation of cross-cultural differences in self-concept using TST came from Kanagawa, Cross, and Markus (2001). American participants were more likely than the Japanese participants to describe themselves in terms of abstract, internal attributes. Japanese participants, on the other hand, described themselves mostly with references to immediate situation, short-term activities, and physical features. More interestingly however, Kanagawa et al. (2001) varied the condition so that the participants took the test either alone, in the presence of a peer, in the group setting, or in the presence of the experimenter. Although there was a certain amount of effect of condition on self-descriptions of American participants, self-descriptions of Japanese were significantly more variable across conditions, which demonstrates the social sensitivity of the collectivistic selves. Using a shorter version of TST (positing the statement seven times), Bochner (1994) obtained comparable results. He compared Malaysian, Australian, and British respondents with a three category coding scheme: Group responses (e.g., "I am a daughter"), idiocentric responses (e.g., "I am intelligent"), and allocentric responses (e.g., "I am a person who wants to help others"). Not surprisingly, more collectivistic Malaysian sample gave more group and less idiocentric responses than the more individualist Australian and British samples.

Cross-cultural differences in self-concept are also demonstrated by methodologies other than the Twenty Statements Test. For example, using the Self-Concept Clarity scale, Campbell, Trapnell, Heine, Katz, Lavalley and Lehman (1996) showed successfully that self-concepts of Japanese were situationally more variable than that of Canadians. Moreover, even though self-concept clarity was strongly correlated with self-esteem for Canadians, this correlation was weaker for the Japanese. Choi and Choi (2002) designed an interesting study in which they asked their American and Korean participants two questions: "How introverted are you?" and "How extraverted are you?" (Study 1). The difference score between the two questions was greater for Koreans than for Americans, indicating greater flexibility of self-concept shifted by the directionality of the questions on the part of Koreans. Similar results also emerged when the same procedure was carried out for other semantically opposite traits (e.g., polite-rude) (Study 2), and competing value statements (e.g., "Equality is more important to me than ambition", vs. "Ambition is more important to me than equality") (Study 3).

A study conducted by Suh (2002) investigated the issue of cross-situational consistency of self more directly. Suh (2002) presented his subjects with several personality traits (e.g., impatient), and made them rate each trait on self-descriptiveness. The same traits were also presented with several specific interaction partners (e.g., "When I interact with my parents, I am impatient") providing a meaningful social context. Two identity consistency indices were created. One of them was the correlation of the general self (the ratings of the personality traits) and the context dependent selves (the same personality traits with different interaction partners). The second one was the consistency of the ordering of the traits as least to most self-descriptive across the social contexts. Comparison of Korean and

American participants clearly revealed that Koreans described themselves less consistently across social situations than Americans (Suh, 2002).

In light of this evidence, it might be proposed that what accounts for the seeming controversy in the self-enhancement literature is the fact that this social context dependency of the interdependent self has been overlooked. Even though sensitivity to social context and low levels of need for uniqueness is proposed as possible reasons for lower levels of self-enhancement for the collectivistic populations, this point has not been explicitly measured. In the research that utilized the better than average paradigm, even though the specific attributes on which people rated themselves were differentiated according to their meaning for different self-systems (e.g., easy-going for interdependent, assertive for independent self-construal), in most of the studies, attributes were presented as abstract traits. If these abstract attributes are meaningless and not self-defining in the interdependent self-system, then self-enhancement would not be observed. If attributes are presented in a socially meaningful context as Suh (2002) did, then it would be possible to observe self-enhancement in people with interdependent self-construal. This kind of a result would greatly support Kurman's (2001b) proposal that self-enhancement is a universal tendency which expresses itself in culturally meaningful ways, rather than the argument that self-enhancement is absent in the collectivistic settings because it is harmful for the motivation of self-improvement to serve the group better.

Indeed, attribute ambiguity and abstractness are important factors influencing self-enhancement. Dunning et al. (1989) showed that ambiguous traits (e.g., sensitive) produced greater levels of self-enhancement than relatively less ambiguous traits (e.g., athletic) (Study 1, 2); and providing descriptions of traits reduced the level of self-enhancement (Study 3). A study employing a free-response paradigm to

assess self-enhancement reported similar results. Taris (1999) made Dutch participants write down as many good and bad things as possible that they did more than other people did, and as many good and bad things possible that other people did more than they did. Not surprisingly, people mentioned more positive and less negative behaviors for themselves than for other people. More interestingly, however, linguistic analyses of the responses revealed that people described their own positive attributes more abstractly (e.g., I am friendly) than they described other people's positive attributes (e.g., they visit their parents often). Similarly, the negative attributes of other people were described in a more abstract way than the negative attributes of self (Taris, 1999). Kurman and Eshel (1998) adopted hierarchical levels of self-evaluation approach to the measurement of self-enhancement. Concerning the academic domain, for example, at the lowest level of abstraction is the rating of one's grades of the previous term. Evaluation of one's success of the previous term is at the second level. And at the most abstract level is general academic self-evaluation. Comparing self-ratings with external criteria, Kurman and Eshel (1998) found that for Israeli subjects self-enhancement was greater at the more abstract levels of self-evaluation.

There is evidence in the literature that this might not be the case for collectivists. Kurman and Sriram (1997) compared Israeli participants with more collectivistic Singaporean Chinese on the same measure used by Kurman and Eshel (1998). Of significant interest here, although the level of self-enhancement increased with the level of abstraction of self-evaluation for the Israelis, this effect was absent for the Singaporeans. One has to keep in mind one important point before drawing direct parallels between current research and that of Kurman and Sriram (1997). In Kurman and Sriram (1997) the most general level of self evaluation (e.g., general

academic success) was abstracted from several lower level behavioral evaluations (e.g., success at several previous courses). One might argue, on the other hand, providing a social context for an abstract trait (e.g., I am *honest* when I am with friends) does not reduce the generality of the behavioral evaluation. Nevertheless, the above mentioned research is certainly relevant to our discussion as it reveals that abstract-specific self-evaluations might be relevant for cultural differences in self-enhancement.

Another indirect evidence comes from Sedikides et al.'s (2003) study in which the overall self-enhancement of Japanese and American participants did not differ. Self-enhancement was measured in two ways: Rating of traits (e.g., agreeable) and rating of behaviors (e.g., avoid open confrontation with your group). First, for the behavior ratings, it is obvious that the statements were context-specific behavioral descriptions. Second, it should be recalled that a context priming exercise was taken before responding to self-enhancement measures, in order to make culture salient to the bicultural Japanese participants. It might be argued that this priming exercise might provide a context for the abstract personality traits to be embedded in, hence raise the self-enhancement level of Japanese. Interestingly, another study which revealed similar levels of self-enhancement for different cultures (Kobayashi & Brown, 2003) presented attributes not as abstract trait adjectives, but in sentence forms (e.g., To what extent are you *competent*?), some of which carried contextual connotations (e.g., To what extent are you *well-liked* by friends?). Although speculative at this point, it might be considered as an indirect evidence for the current discussion.

### The Present Study

The major aim of the present study is to show that self-enhancement is a universal tendency that exists both in the collectivistic and individualistic self-systems but expressed quite differently. However, social-context dependency should also be considered. Correspondingly, the two aims of the study are to show boosting effect of each self-construal on self-enhancement for the corresponding traits, and to show that abstractness and context-specificity of traits have differential influence on self-enhancement for those high on individual and high on collective self-construals. This is the first study in the literature that employs the above average method for measuring self-enhancement in which context was systematically varied for identical personality traits.

Another departure point from the literature is the measurement of self-construal. There are some studies of self-enhancement in which participants' self-construals or the relative position of the sample on collectivism/individualism is assumed on the basis of previous studies, rather than being explicitly measured (e.g., Heine & Lehman, 1995; Heine & Lehman, 1997; Kitayama et al., 1997; Yik et al., 1998). When a self-construal measure is taken as an individual variable, a two dimensional scale such as Singelis' (1994) independent-interdependent self-construal scale has usually been used (e.g., Norasakkunkit & Kalick, 2002; Sedikides et al., 2003). However, recent literature shows that self-construal is conceptualized better as a three dimensional construct than two (Y. Kashima, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand, & Yuki, 1995). According to this argument, the individualistic dimension of self is conceptualizing oneself as unique and autonomous, similar to Markus and Kitayama's (1991) independent self construal. The relational self is derived from significant relationships, and it can be defined as the interpersonal aspect of the self

(see for example Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000; Cross & Morris, 2003). The collective self, on the other hand, is derived from one's membership in social categories or groups. For example, defining oneself as member of a cultural group and strongly adhering to that group's norms would imply the collective aspect of the self, not the relational aspect. As Y. Kashima et al. (1995) argue, in a two dimensional conceptualization of self-construal, the distinction between relational and collective aspects of self would be confounded, as they are in the interdependent self-construal of Singelis (1994). Indeed there is empirical evidence concerning the differentiation of the two aspects (relational and collective) of the self (Brewer & Gardner, 1996).

Recently, E. S. Kashima and Hardie (2000) developed the Relational, Individual, and Collective Self-Aspects (RIC) scale that measures these three aspects of the self. The initial validation study revealed that individual, relational and collective aspects of this scale correlated in expected directions with several previous self-construal scales. For example, the individual subscale correlated positively with Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, and Gelfand's (1995) horizontal and vertical individualism, and Singelis' (1994) independence scales, and correlated negatively with Singelis' (1994) interdependence scale. The collective subscale correlated positively with Singelis et al.'s (1995) horizontal and vertical collectivism, and Singelis' (1994) interdependence scales. Similarly, the relational subscale correlated positively with relational dimension of the scale that was developed by Y. Kashima et al. (1995). In the current study this scale was employed in order to differentiate better between the collective and the relational aspects of the interdependent self-system.

Concerning the domain specificity of self-enhancement, people high on individual, collective, and relational self-construals are expected to self-enhance on traits that are differentially meaningful for their self-construal more than people low on the respective self-construal. Concerning the context specificity of self-enhancement, people high on individual self-construal are expected to self-enhance more on abstract traits, whereas people high on collective self-construal are expected to self-enhance more on traits that are presented in a meaningful social context. There are no a priori assumptions about the context dependent self enhancement of people high on relational self.

### Hypotheses

Hyp 1: Self-construal will have an effect on self-enhancement on abstract traits in such a way that:

- a. Individuals high on relational self-construal will self-enhance on relational traits more than individuals low on relational self-construal,
- b. Individuals high on individual self-construal will self-enhance on individual traits more than individuals low on individual self-construal,
- c. Individuals high on collective self-construal will self-enhance on collective traits more than individuals low on collective self-construal.

Hyp 2a: Overall, on abstract adjective traits, people high on individual self-construal will self-enhance more than people high on collective self-construal.

Hyp 2b: On the same adjective traits that are embedded in a meaningful social context, people high on collective self-construal will self-enhance more than people high on individual self-construal.

## Method

### Participants

The sample consisted of 435 university students (207 females, 228 males). The age range was between 17 and 30 with a mean of 20.28 ( $SD = 1.92$ ). Students at four universities in İstanbul participated in the study. The first group consisted of 90 introductory psychology students (39 female, 51 male) from various department at Boğaziçi University. The second group was composed of 80 students (28 female, 52 male) from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and from various Faculties of Engineering at İstanbul Technical University. The third group consisted of 90 students (45 female, 45 male) from the Faculty of Education at Marmara University. Two groups were recruited from among the students of İstanbul University; 87 students (73 female, 14 male) from the Faculty of Arts, and 88 students (22 female, 66 male) from Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Medicine.

### Instrument

The instrument was composed of two questionnaires that consisted of a demographic information form (see Appendix A and L for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively), a self-construal scale, and three self-enhancement inventories.

#### Self-Construal

Self-construal was measured by E. S. Kashima and Hardie's (2000) Relational, Individual, and Collective Self-Aspects (RIC) Scale. This scale consists of 10 statements each of which is followed by three response items corresponding to the relational, individual, and collective aspects of the self. Each of the response items are rated separately on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not like me, not true of

me) to 7 (like me, very true of me). For their Australian sample E. S. Kashima and Hardie (2000) reported Cronbach's alpha of .81, .72, and .78 for the relational, individual, and collective subscales of the RIC, respectively. In a Turkish sample similar reliability levels (.81, .74, and .88 for the relational, individual, and collective subscales, respectively) have been reported by Fişek (2003, personal communication). In the Turkish version of the scale, items 1a, 2c, 3b, 4a, 5b, 6b, 7a, 8b, 9a, 10b correspond to the relational self, items 1b, 2b, 3c, 4c, 5a, 6a, 7c, 8c, 9c, 10a correspond to the individual self, and items 1c, 2a, 3a, 4b, 5c, 6c, 7b, 8a, 9b, 10c correspond to the collective self (See Appendix B and M for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively).

### Self-Enhancement

Self-enhancement was measured in two ways, abstract and context-specific.

Abstract self-enhancement. Abstract self-enhancement was measured by a list of 18 relational, individual, and collective trait adjectives. Respondents were asked to indicate how well each personality characteristic described them compared to the university students of the same sex at their university on a 7-point scale, -3 (I possess this attribute much less than other people do), 0 (I possess this attribute as much as other people do), 3 (I possess this attribute much more than other people do) (see Appendix C and N for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively).

Each participant received four scores for this measure. The average rating scores of each set of the relational, individual, and collective items served as the abstract relational, abstract individual, and abstract collective self-enhancement scores, respectively, and an overall self-enhancement score as the average score of all of the items.

Context-specific self-enhancement. The same trait rating list was used as the measure of context-specific self-enhancement with two changes. First, a context priming exercise took place immediately before the trait rating lists. This context priming exercise was modeled after a similar task used by Sedikides et al. (2003) in order to make the culture salient to their bi-cultural participants. Sedikides et al. (2003) made their participants imagine and write small essays on being in their homeland, walking along the streets, being with their friends, and family, and similar familiar situations. In the present study, a similar context priming exercise was used so that participants did not rate their personality characteristics in general, but as they are in specific contexts. Two contexts, home and school, which have been frequently used in the literature, were selected. For the home-context priming task, participants were asked to respond to four open ended questions about a typical day at home with their family (see Appendix D and O for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively). Following this exercise there was a manipulation check of two questions. The first question asked participants to what degree they had imagined themselves in their home on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (I could not visualize my family environment at all) to 7 (I visualized my family environment very vividly). The second question asked participants to what degree they had felt as if they were at home, on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (I did not feel as if I were with my family at all) to 7 (I felt very much as if I were with my family) (see Appendix E and P for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively). Immediately following the context priming exercise and the manipulation check, the same trait rating list was given with a change in the instructions. It was explicitly stated that while they made comparisons between themselves and the average college student on each personality characteristic, they should consider their own personality not in general, but as they

are in their home environment with their family. This instruction method was modeled after the instructions of the self-certainty task used by Sarıbay (2002) (see Appendix F and Q for the Turkish and the English versions of the home self-enhancement inventory).

Similarly, for school-context priming task, participants were asked to answer open ended questions about a typical day at school with their friends (see Appendix G and R for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively). The manipulation check items followed the school-context priming task (see Appendix H and S for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively). Immediately following the school-context priming exercise and the manipulation check, the same trait rating list was introduced with appropriate instructions (see Appendix I and T for the Turkish and the English versions, respectively).

Each participant responded to both of the context-specific self-enhancement measures (i.e., home and school). Participants received four scores for each context-specific self-enhancement measure comparable to those of the abstract self-enhancement measure (i.e., relational, individual, collective, and overall home-context-specific self-enhancement; relational, individual, collective, and overall school-context-specific self-enhancement).

#### Filler Scale

Although not included in the analyses, satisfaction subscale of the Adult Sources of Self-Esteem Inventory (ASSEI) (Elovson & Fleming, 1989) was also included in the inventory as a filler scale, in order to prevent tediousness caused by the repetitive rating of unanimous self-enhancement measures. The ASSEI was translated into Turkish by Sunar, İnelman, Israel, Karabatı, Karamolla and Üner

(1994) (see Appendix K and U, for the Turkish and the English versions of ASSEI Satisfaction Subscale).

## Procedure

### Pilot Study

The specific list of trait adjectives that were used as the self-enhancement measure was determined by a pilot study that is described in Appendix J.

### Main Study

Students at all the universities except for Boğaziçi University were asked to participate in the study with the permission of the instructors; those who agreed to take part filled out the questionnaire voluntarily in classroom settings. Boğaziçi University students were enrolled in introductory psychology courses in spring 2004 and received extra course credit for their participation.

Each session was held in classroom settings of 10 to 40 participants, except for İstanbul University Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Medicine. Eighty-eight Faculty of Medicine students filled out the questionnaires in a large lecture hall in one session. Participants received the instrument as two separate questionnaires. The first questionnaire consisted of the demographic information form, RIC scale, and the inventory of abstract self-enhancement. Upon completion, it was collected and the second questionnaire including the home-context priming task, the manipulation check, the inventory of home-context self-enhancement, the school-context priming task, the manipulation check, and the inventory of school-context self-enhancement was distributed. The whole procedure took approximately 45 minutes.

In terms of the first questionnaire, the demographic information form appeared on the first page. Half of the questionnaires had the abstract self-

enhancement inventory before the RIC scale, and in the other half, this order was reversed. The order of the items in the abstract self-enhancement inventory was also counterbalanced in such a way that half of the traits were presented either as the first or the second half of the inventory. In terms of the second questionnaire, half of the questionnaires had the inventory of home-context self-enhancement before the inventory of school-context self-enhancement. This order was reversed for the other half. Each context-specific self-enhancement inventory was preceded by the relevant priming task and the manipulation check. For each participant, the ordering of the items of self-enhancement inventories was the same for all the three measures (i.e., abstract, home, and school). The satisfaction subscale of the Adult Sources of Self-Esteem Inventory (ASSEI) was inserted in between the two context-specific self-enhancement inventories.

## Results

### Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables

The means, standard deviations, ranges of possible and actual scores for the scales used and their Cronbach's alphas are presented in Table 1. Reliability analyses of the self-enhancement inventories revealed that the elimination of the item *courageous* (*cesur*) consistently increased Cronbach's alpha of the abstract-collective, home-context-collective, and school-context-collective subscales from .55 to .59, from .66 to .69., and from .64 to .68, respectively. Hence, in all of the following analyses, relational and individual subscales of the three self-enhancement inventories are composed of the six items that were determined in the pilot study. The collective subscales, on the other hand, are composed of five items, excluding the item *courageous*. Altogether, 17 items were used in the following analyses for overall self-enhancement.

The relational, individual, and collective self-construal scores were calculated by averaging the scores of the relational, individual, and collective items of RIC, respectively. Relational, individual, and collective self-enhancement scores of the abstract inventory were calculated by averaging the relevant items for each: *dikkatli* (careful), *hareketli* (active), *konuskan* (talkative), *huzurlu* (serene), *coşkulu* (ebullient), and *özverili* (self-sacrificing) for relational; *serinkanlı* (cool-headed), *hazırcevap* (good at repartee), *prensip sahibi* (principled), *açık sözlü* (frank), *pratik* (practical), and *etkili* (effective) for individual; *tedbirli* (prudent), *sade* (plain), *gayretli* (diligent), *düzenli* (tidy), and *işbirliğine yatkın* (cooperative) for collective. Overall abstract self-enhancement score was calculated by taking the mean of these 17 items. The context-specific self-enhancement scores were calculated similarly by taking the means of the relevant items of the correspondent inventories.

Table 1

Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Possible Range of Scores	Actual Range of Scores	Cronbach's Alpha
RIC_relational	5.62	.76	1 – 7	1.00 – 7.00	.76
RIC_individual	5.96	.66	1 – 7	3.50 – 7.00	.69
RIC_collective	5.12	.99	1 – 7	1.10 – 6.80	.85
Abstract_overall	.91	.75	-3 – 3	-1.18 – 2.76	.79
Abstract_relational	.84	.97	-3 – 3	-2.00 – 2.83	.66
Abstract_individual	.93	.96	-3 – 3	-2.00 – 3.00	.67
Abstract_collective	.97	.96	-3 – 3	-1.80 – 3.00	.59
Home_overall	1.17	.79	-3 – 3	-3.00 – 2.88	.82
Home_relational	1.25	1.00	-3 – 3	-3.00 – 3.00	.72
Home_individual	1.27	.89	-3 – 3	-3.00 – 3.00	.61
Home_collective	.94	1.09	-3 – 3	-3.00 – 3.00	.69
School_overall	1.10	.82	-3 – 3	-2.00 – 2.94	.86
School_relational	1.07	1.05	-3 – 3	-3.00 – 3.00	.77
School_individual	1.14	.96	-3 – 3	-2.50 – 3.00	.73
School_collective	1.07	.99	-3 – 3	-2.20 – 3.00	.67

Note. RIC\_relational = Relational subscale score of RIC, RIC\_individual = Individual subscale score of RIC, RIC\_collective = Collective subscale score of RIC, Abstract\_overall = Overall abstract self-enhancement, Abstract\_relational = Relational abstract self-enhancement, Abstract\_individual = Individual abstract self-enhancement, Abstract\_collective = Collective abstract self-enhancement, Home\_overall = Overall home-context self-enhancement, Home\_relational = Relational home-context self-enhancement, Home\_individual = Individual home-context self-enhancement, Home\_collective = Collective home-context self-enhancement, School\_overall = Overall school-context self-enhancement, School\_relational = Relational school-context self-enhancement, School\_individual = Individual school-context self-enhancement, School\_collective = Collective school-context self-enhancement.

### Preliminary Analyses

Before proceeding with the main analyses, the prevailing self-construal of the participants was explored. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted in order to compare the relational, individual, and collective subscales of RIC for the whole sample ( $N = 427$ ). Since sphericity assumption was not met, Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon was utilized for adjusting the degrees of freedom. The results of this ANOVA revealed a significant factor effect,  $F(1.71, 728.08) = 174.22, p = .000$ . Pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni) revealed significant mean differences among all possible pairs of comparisons (see Table 2). Hence, the individual self-construal was the highest ( $M = 5.97, SD = .65$ ), followed by the relational self-construal ( $M = 5.62, SD = .76$ ). The lowest self-construal was the collective ( $M = 5.12, SD = .99$ ).

Table 2

#### Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Construals

Self-Construal	<u>Mean Difference</u>	<u>SE</u>
Relational-Individual	-.35*	.04
Relational-Collective	.50*	.04
Individual-Collective	.85*	.05

Note. \*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Scores on each self-enhancement inventory and subscales were also examined for the whole sample. Separate one-sample  $t$  tests were carried out in order to evaluate whether means were significantly different from the middle point 0 (indication of no self-enhancement). Results indicated the presence of self-enhancement on each of the 12 subscales (See Table 3)

Table 3

Summary of One-Sample t Tests for Self-Enhancement Subscales

Subscale	<u>Mean Difference</u>	df	t
Abstract_overall	.91	430	25.25*
Abstract_relational	.84	430	17.95*
Abstract_individual	.93	430	19.97*
Abstract_collective	.97	430	20.94*
Home_overall	1.17	420	30.16*
Home_relational	1.25	419	25.67*
Home_individual	1.27	420	29.33*
Home_collective	.94	420	17.59*
School_overall	1.10	418	27.24*
School_relational	1.07	420	20.93*
School_individual	1.14	420	24.50*
School_collective	1.07	420	22.23*

Note. \* $p < .01$

Next, a repeated measures ANOVA was carried out in order to compare self-enhancement on relational, individual, and collective abstract traits ( $N = 431$ ). The result was significant,  $F(1.86, 801.03) = 3.22$ ,  $p = .044$ , using the Greenhouse-Geisser correction. Pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni) revealed significant differences between relational ( $M = .84$ ,  $SD = .97$ ) and collective ( $M = .97$ ,  $SD = .96$ ) self-enhancement. The difference between relational and individual ( $M = .93$ ,  $SD = .96$ ), and between collective and individual self-enhancement was not significant, which indicated that self-enhancement on collective items was greater than self-enhancement on relational items (see Table 4).

Table 4

Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Abstract Traits

Abstract Self-Enhancement	Mean Difference	SE
Relational-Individual	-.09	.05
Relational-Collective	-.13*	.05
Individual-Collective	-.04	.06

Note. \*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Self-enhancement on different scales (i.e., abstract, home, and school-context) was also examined for the whole sample. Because abstract self-enhancement was compared to context-specific self-enhancement in the following analysis, sample size was reduced to 324 participants due to the manipulation check which will be described later in the next section. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant factor effect,  $F(1.75, 566.47) = 45.17, p = .000$ , using the Greenhouse-Geisser correction. Pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni) revealed significant mean differences between abstract ( $M = .96, SD = .75$ ) and home-context ( $M = 1.24, SD = .78$ ), and between abstract and school-context ( $M = 1.18, SD = .82$ ) overall self-enhancement, which indicated that participants self-enhanced on abstract traits less than they self-enhanced on context-specific traits. Self-enhancement on two context-specific traits (home and school) did not differ significantly from each other (see Table 5).

Table 5

Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Overall Measures

Self-Enhancement	Mean Difference	SE
Abstract-Home	-.28*	.03
Abstract-School	-.22*	.03
Home-School	.07	.04

Note. \*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Results Concerning the Hypotheses

The intercorrelations among all the variables of the study as Pearson correlation coefficients are presented in Table 6.

The Relationship between Self-Construal Scores and Abstract Self-Enhancement on Relational, Individual, and Collective Traits

In order to test Hypothesis 1, several analyses were carried out. First, correlations between self-construal scores and self-enhancement on different traits (relational, individual, and collective) were examined. Following this, independent-samples  $t$  tests were conducted to compare group means of self-enhancement. Last, regression analyses were carried out to observe the unique contribution each self-construal has on self-enhancement scores.

Hypothesis 1a predicted that individuals high on relational self-construal would self-enhance on relational traits more than individuals low on relational self-construal. Table 6 reveals that all three self construal scores have significant positive correlations with abstract relational self-enhancement. Next, participants were divided into two groups using the median of relational self-construal scores (5.70). Those above the median were classified as the high relational ( $N = 207$ ) and those

Table 6

Intercorrelations among the Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. RIC_relational	-	.27**	.58**	.13**	.18**	.01	.10*	.16**	.20**	.05	.14**	.14**	.18**	.03	.13**
2. RIC_individual		-	.11**	.23**	.17**	.15**	.23**	.27**	.20**	.21**	.25**	.24**	.15**	.18**	.29**
3. RIC_collective			-	.16**	.12*	.05	.20**	.18**	.15**	.08	.20**	.16**	.14**	.04	.23**
4. Abstract_overall				-	.85**	.80**	.66**	.70**	.56**	.59**	.54**	.83**	.72**	.72**	.60**
5. Abstract_relational					-	.54**	.37**	.56**	.58**	.42**	.34**	.68**	.76**	.51**	.36**
6. Abstract_individual						-	.25**	.55**	.36**	.69**	.28**	.67**	.49**	.84**	.30**
7. Abstract_collective							-	.50**	.33**	.22**	.67**	.56**	.38**	.26**	.79**
8. Home_overall								-	.85**	.80**	.76**	.72**	.59**	.61**	.57**
9. Home_relational									-	.55**	.46**	.57**	.58**	.43**	.38**
10. Home_individual										-	.39**	.60**	.44**	.73**	.29**
11. Home_collective											-	.55**	.39**	.32**	.69**
12. School_overall												-	.89**	.83**	.73**
13. School_relational													-	.65**	.49**
14. School_individual														-	.37**
15. School_collective															-

Note. \*p < .05 (2-tailed)

\*\*p < .01 (2-tailed)

below the median were classified as the low-relational ( $N = 202$ ) self-construal group. An independent-samples  $t$  test was conducted to evaluate the high and the low relational self-construal groups in terms of relational-abstract self-enhancement. The result was significant,  $t(407) = 4.51$ ,  $p = .000$ , with a medium effect size ( $\eta^2 = .05$ ), indicating that relational-abstract self-enhancement scores of individuals high on relational self-construal ( $M = 1.03$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ ) were higher than that of individuals low on relational self-construal ( $M = .60$ ,  $SD = .88$ ). The results of this analysis supported the prediction of hypothesis 1a.

Following this, a standard multiple regression analysis in which relational, individual, and collective self-construal scores were regressed on abstract relational self-enhancement was conducted. The linear combination of self-construal scores was significantly related to self-enhancement on abstract-relational items,  $F(3, 422) = 7.16$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $R^2 = .048$ , indicating that approximately 4.8 % of the variance in abstract-relational self-enhancement was explained by self-construal. As seen in Table 7, both individual and relational self-construal made unique, significant contributions to the prediction of abstract relational self-enhancement. Higher individual and relational self-construals indicated more self-enhancement on relational abstract traits.

Table 7

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Relational Abstract Self-Enhancement (N = 426)

Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	$\beta$
RIC_relational	.16	.08	.12*
RIC_individual	.20	.07	.13**
RIC_collective	.04	.06	.04

Note.  $R^2 = .048$

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

Hypothesis 1b predicted that individuals high on individual self-construal would self-enhance on individual traits more than individuals low on individual self-construal. In order to test this hypothesis, first, the relationship between different self-construal scores and abstract-individual self-enhancement score was examined. As seen in Table 6, only the correlation between RIC\_individual and abstract individual self-enhancement was significant ( $r = .15$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Next, participants were divided into two groups using the median of individual self-construal scores (6.10). Those above the median were classified as the high individual ( $N = 192$ ) and those below the median were classified as the low-individual ( $N = 200$ ) self-construal group. The results of the independent samples  $t$  test showed that individual-abstract self-enhancement scores of individuals high on individual self-construal ( $M = 1.04$ ,  $SD = .95$ ) were higher than that of individuals low on individual self-construal ( $M = .79$ ,  $SD = .93$ ),  $t(390) = 2.64$ ,  $p = .009$ , with a small effect size ( $\eta^2 = .02$ ).

Following this, a standard multiple regression analysis in which relational, individual, and collective self-construal scores were regressed on abstract individual self-enhancement was conducted. The linear combination of self-construal scores

was significantly related to self-enhancement on abstract-individual items,  $F(3, 422) = 3.90$ ,  $p = .009$ ,  $R^2 = .027$ , indicating that approximately 2.7 % of the variance in abstract-individual self-enhancement was explained by self-construal. As seen in Table 8, individual self-construal made a unique, significant contribution to the prediction of abstract individual self-enhancement. Higher individual self-construal indicated more self-enhancement on individual abstract traits. Overall, the analyses supported the prediction of hypothesis 1b.

Table 8

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting

Individual Abstract Self-Enhancement (N = 426)

Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	$\beta$
RIC_relational	-.09	.08	-.07
RIC_individual	.24	.07	.13*
RIC_collective	.07	.06	.08

Note.  $R^2 = .027$

\* $p < .01$ .

Hypothesis 1c predicted that individuals high on collective self-construal would self-enhance on collective traits more than individuals low on collective self-construal. Table 6 reveals that all three self construal scores have significant positive correlations with abstract collective self-enhancement. Next, participants were divided into two groups using the median of collective self-construal scores (5.20). Those above the median were classified as the high collective ( $N = 205$ ) and those below the median were classified as the low-collective ( $N = 202$ ) self-construal group. An independent samples  $t$  test was conducted to evaluate the high and the low collective self-construal groups in terms of collective-abstract self-enhancement. Collective-abstract self-enhancement scores of individuals high on collective self-

construal ( $M = 1.18$ ,  $SD = .90$ ) were higher than that of individuals low on collective self-construal ( $M = .73$ ,  $SD = .97$ ),  $t(405) = 4.90$ ,  $p = .000$ , with a medium effect size ( $\eta^2 = .06$ ). The results of this analysis supported the prediction of hypothesis 1c.

Next, a standard multiple regression analysis in which relational, individual, and collective self-construal scores were regressed on abstract collective self-enhancement was conducted. The linear combination of self-construal scores was significantly related to self-enhancement on abstract-collective items,  $F(3, 422) = 13.40$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $R^2 = .087$ , indicating that approximately 8.7 % of the variance in abstract-collective self-enhancement was explained by self-construal. As seen in Table 9, individual and collective self-construal made unique, significant contributions to the prediction of abstract collective self-enhancement. Higher individual and collective self-construals indicated more self-enhancement on collective abstract traits.

Table 9

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting Collective Abstract Self-Enhancement (N = 426)

Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	$\beta$
RIC_relational	-.11	.08	-.09
RIC_individual	.33	.07	.22*
RIC_collective	.22	.06	.23*

Note.  $R^2 = .087$

\* $p < .01$ .

### The Relationship between Self-Construal Scores and Abstract versus Context-Specific Self-Enhancement

Hypothesis 2 predicted that overall, on abstract adjective traits, people high on individual self-construal would self-enhance more than people high on collective self-construal; whereas on the same adjective traits that are embedded in a meaningful social context, people high on collective self-construal would self-enhance more than people high on individual self-construal. Before testing this hypothesis, the manipulation checks for both home and school context priming exercises were examined. The scores on the two manipulation check questions were averaged for each context and frequency analyses were conducted. For the home task, the mean score of the sample was 5.66 and 75 % of the participants scored 5 or above. For the school task, the mean score was 5.39 and 75 % of the participants scored 4.5 or above. Since most of the responses were above the middle point (4), these results suggest that the manipulation was successful. Nevertheless, for the following analyses, 101 participants whose manipulation check score fell below 4 for at least one context (home or school) were not included. Furthermore, 5 participants' data were discarded due to unrelated responses to the context priming task questions, leaving a total sample size of 329.

In order to test the predictions of hypothesis 2, first, the correlations between self-construal and overall self-enhancement scores were examined. Table 6 reveals that all three self-construal scores have positive correlations with overall abstract, home and school context self-enhancement scores.

Secondly, participants were divided into two groups using the medians of RIC\_individual scores (6.10) and of RIC\_collective scores (5.20). Those above the median of RIC\_individual (6.10) and below the median of RIC\_collective (5.20)

were classified as individual self-construal group ( $N = 66$ ). Those above the median of RIC\_collective (5.20) and below the median of RIC\_individual (6.10) were classified as collective self-construal group ( $N = 58$ ). A mixed design ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the individual and the collective self-construal groups in terms of abstract, home and school-context self-enhancement. The within groups factor was overall self-enhancement with three levels: abstract, home-context, and school-context. Since sphericity assumption was not met, Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon was used for the adjusted degrees of freedom. The main effect of repeated factor was significant,  $F(1.68, 204.95) = 15.22, p = .000$ . Pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni) adjustment revealed significant mean differences between abstract ( $M = .87, SD = .72$ ) and home-context ( $M = 1.16, SD = .75$ ) overall self-enhancement, and between abstract and school context ( $M = 1.09, SD = .78$ ) overall self-enhancement, averaged across the groups. Mean difference between home-context and school-context self-enhancement was not significant (see Table 10). There was no significant interaction of group and repeated factor effects,  $F(1.68, 204.95) = .34, ns$ . However, the observed power was too small (.099) to draw strong conclusions. Similarly, main effect of group was not

Table 10

Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Overall Measures Averaged

Across the Groups

Self-Enhancement	Mean Difference	SE
Abstract-Home	-.29*	.06
Abstract-School	-.22*	.04
Home-School	.07	.06

Note. \*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

significant,  $F(1, 122) = 1.49$ , *ns*, indicating that those high on collective self-construal ( $M = .97$ ) and those high on individual self-construal ( $M = 1.11$ ) did not differ in self-enhancement averaged across measures. However, observed power was small also for the between groups factor (.228). Means and standard deviations of self-enhancement scores of each group are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations of Overall Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups

Type of Self-Enhancement	Individual		Collective	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Overall Abstract	.95	(.71)	.78	(.72)
Overall Home-Context	1.21	(.78)	1.11	(.71)
Overall School-Context	1.17	(.78)	1.00	(.78)
Total	1.11		.97	

As is evident in the lack of interaction of group and repeated factor effects, neither Hypothesis 2a, which predicted higher overall abstract self-enhancement for the individual self-construal group than the collective self-construal group nor Hypothesis 2b, which predicted higher overall context-specific self-enhancement for the collective self-construal group than the individual self-construal group was confirmed. Instead, participants of both groups self-enhanced on abstract traits less than they self-enhanced on context-specific traits. Self-enhancement on two context-specific traits (home and school) did not differ significantly from each other.

Next, three separate multiple regression analyses were carried out in order to observe the unique contribution each self-construal had on three overall self-enhancement scores. In terms of the first standard multiple regression analysis in

which relational, individual, and collective self-construal scores were regressed on overall abstract self-enhancement, the linear combination of self-construal scores was significantly related to self-enhancement on abstract items,  $F(3, 308) = 13.69$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $R^2 = .118$ , indicating that approximately 11.8 % of the variance in overall abstract self-enhancement was explained by self-construal. As seen in Table 12, individual and collective self-construal made unique, significant contributions to the prediction of overall abstract self-enhancement. Higher individual and collective self-construals indicated more self-enhancement on abstract traits.

Table 12

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores Predicting

Overall Abstract Self-Enhancement (N = 312)

Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	$\beta$
RIC_relational	-3,2E-02	.07	-.03
RIC_individual	.34	.07	.29*
RIC_collective	.15	.05	.19*

Note.  $R^2 = .118$

\* $p < .01$ .

In terms of the second standard multiple regression analysis in which relational, individual, and collective self-construal scores were regressed on overall home-context self-enhancement, the linear combination of self-construal scores was significantly related to self-enhancement on home-context items,  $F(3, 304) = 14.87$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $R^2 = .128$ , indicating that approximately 12.8 % of the variance in overall home-context self-enhancement was explained by self-construal. As seen in Table 13, individual and collective self-construal made unique, significant contributions to the prediction of overall home-context self-enhancement. Higher individual and collective self-construals indicated more self-enhancement on home-context traits.

Table 13

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores PredictingOverall Home-Context Self-Enhancement (N = 308)

Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	$\beta$
RIC_relational	-7,1E-02	.08	-.07
RIC_individual	.37	.07	.32*
RIC_collective	.15	.06	.18*

Note.  $R^2 = .118$

\* $p < .01$ .

In terms of the third standard multiple regression analysis in which relational, individual, and collective self-construal scores were regressed on overall school-context self-enhancement, the linear combination of self-construal scores was significantly related to self-enhancement on school-context items,  $F(3, 305) = 12.46$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $R^2 = .109$ , indicating that approximately 10.9 % of the variance in overall school-context self-enhancement was explained by self-construal. As seen in Table 14, individual and collective self-construal made unique, significant contributions to the prediction of overall school-context self-enhancement. Higher individual and collective self-construals indicated more self-enhancement on school-context traits.

Table 14

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Self-Construal Scores PredictingOverall School-Context Self-Enhancement (N = 309)

Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	$\beta$
RIC_relational	-9,2E-02	.08	-.08
RIC_individual	.32	.07	.26*
RIC_collective	.22	.06	.25*

Note.  $R^2 = .118$

\* $p < .01$ .

Although all three self-construal scores have positive correlations with the three overall self-enhancement scores (abstract, home, school), the results of the above regression analyses reveal that considering the three scores together renders the effect of relational self-construal insignificant.

Overall, the analyses failed to support the predictions of hypothesis 2. Although not proposed explicitly as a research hypothesis, it should be interesting to explore if the same effect is observed when the comparison is made for self-enhancement on different traits (relational, individual, and collective) instead of overall.

In order to explore this, three separate mixed design ANOVAs were conducted. For all the three ANOVAs that follow, since sphericity assumption was not met, Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon was used for the adjusted degrees of freedom. For the first ANOVA, the within subjects factor was relational self-enhancement with three levels: abstract, home, and school-context. The main effect of the repeated factor was significant,  $F(1.76, 217.88) = 11.78, p = .000$ . Pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni) revealed significant mean differences between abstract ( $M = .81, SD = .94$ ) and home-context ( $M = 1.20, SD = .99$ ) relational self-enhancement, and between abstract and school-context ( $M = 1.06, SD = 1.00$ ) relational self-enhancement averaged across the groups, which indicated that relational self-enhancement was less for abstract items than for the context-specific items for both groups. Mean difference between home-context and school-context relational self-enhancement was not significant (see Table 15).

Table 15

Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Relational Traits Averaged Across the Groups

Relational		
Self-Enhancement	Mean Difference	SE
Abstract-Home	-.40*	.09
Abstract-School	-.25*	.07
Home-School	.15	.09

Note. \*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The factor group interaction was not significant,  $F(1.76, 217.88) = .86$ , *ns*. Similarly, there was no significant difference between the groups,  $F(1, 124) = 1.13$ , *ns*, in terms of self-enhancement on relational items averaged across the measures. Means and standard deviations of self-enhancement scores of each group are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations of Relational Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups

Type of Self-Enhancement	Individual		Collective	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Relational Abstract	.91	(.93)	.68	(.94)
Relational Home-Context	1.21	(1.06)	1.18	(.92)
Relational School-Context	1.15	(1.02)	.95	(.98)
Total	1.09		.94	

A similar mixed design ANOVA was conducted for the within subjects factor individual self-enhancement with three levels: abstract, home-context, and

school-context. The main effect of repeated factor was significant,  $F(1.63, 202.34) = 19.09, p = .000$ . Pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni) revealed significant mean differences among all possible pairs of comparisons. Thus, the highest individual self-enhancement score was for the home context ( $M = 1.29, SD = .86$ ), followed by the school-context ( $M = 1.14, SD = .94$ ); the lowest individual self-enhancement was for the abstract ( $M = .91, SD = .95$ ) (see Table 17).

Table 17

Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Individual Traits Averaged Across the Groups

Individual		
Self-Enhancement	<u>Mean Difference</u>	<u>SE</u>
Abstract-Home	-.38*	.07
Abstract-School	-.22*	.05
Home-School	.16	.06

Note. \*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The results also revealed that the factor group interaction was not significant,  $F(1.63, 202.34) = .08, ns$ . Similarly, there was no significant difference between the groups,  $F(1, 124) = 1.86, ns$ , in terms of self-enhancement on individual items averaged across the measures. Means and standard deviations of self-enhancement scores of each group are presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups

Type of Self-Enhancement	Individual		Collective	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Individual Abstract	1.00	(1.00)	.82	(.90)
Individual Home-Context	1.40	(.89)	1.18	(.81)
Individual School-Context	1.24	(.98)	1.02	(.85)
Total	1.21		1.01	

A third mixed design ANOVA was conducted in order to examine the effect of self-construal on collective self-enhancement with three levels: abstract, home-context, and school-context. Results revealed that the main effect of the repeated factor was not significant,  $F(1.89, 234.50) = 2.78, p = .067$ . However, the observed power was too small (.529) to draw strong conclusions. Considering that the factor effect marginally approached significance, pairwise comparisons with LSD were carried out. Averaged across the groups, mean differences between abstract ( $\underline{M} = .89, \underline{SD} = .98$ ) and home-context ( $\underline{M} = .98, \underline{SD} = 1.02$ ) collective self-enhancement, and between home-context and school-context ( $\underline{M} = 1.07, \underline{SD} = .94$ ) collective self-enhancement were not significant. However, mean difference between abstract and school-context self-enhancement was significant, which suggested that both groups of subjects self-enhanced on school-context collective items more than they self-enhanced on abstract collective items (see Table 19). The factor group interaction was not significant,  $F(1.89, 234.50) = .05, ns$ . Similarly, there was no significant difference between the groups,  $F(1, 124) = .427, ns$ , in terms of self-enhancement on

collective items averaged across the measures . Means and standard deviations of self-enhancement scores of each group are presented in Table 20.

Table 19

Pairwise Comparisons among Self-Enhancement on Collective Traits Averaged Across the Groups

Collective		
Self-Enhancement	<u>Mean Difference</u>	<u>SE</u>
Abstract-Home	-.09	.08
Abstract-School	-.18*	.07
Home-School	-.09	.08

Note. \*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations of Collective Self-Enhancement of Individual and Collective Groups

Type of Self-Enhancement	Individual		Collective	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Collective Abstract	.95	(.99)	.83	(.97)
Collective Home-Context	1.01	(1.04)	.94	(1.00)
Collective School-Context	1.12	(.92)	1.02	(.96)
Total	1.03		.93	

As is obvious from the lack of repeated factor and group interactions in all of the above ANOVAs, participants with individual and collective self-construals did not differ from each other on specific trait self-enhancement, as was the case for overall self-enhancement.

## Discussion

There were two main aims of this study. The first aim was to show that each self-construal increases self-enhancement on personality characteristics that are desirable for that particular self-construal. When people were grouped as high or low for the three self-construals and compared on self-enhancement for differentially desirable traits, the results were in line with the predictions. Specifically, people high on individual, relational, and collective self-construals self-enhanced on individual, relational, and collective abstract traits, respectively, more than people low on these three self-construals. These results clearly showed the boosting effect of each self-construal on self-enhancement for the corresponding traits. On the other hand, multiple regression analyses revealed mixed results. Both relational and individual self-construals were found to be related positively to self-enhancement on relational traits. Similarly, both collective and individual self-construals were related positively to self-enhancement on collective traits. Self-enhancement on individual traits, on the other hand, was related only to individual self-construal. Hence, individual self-construal was the predictor of self-enhancement on all three measures, and relational and collective self-construals were additional predictors of self-enhancement for the corresponding traits (relational and collective, respectively). Therefore, individual self-construal appeared as a more consistent predictor of self-enhancement across the measures. Yet, the fact that independent self-construal is related to all three self-enhancement measures does not mean lower levels of self-enhancement for relational and collective selves. In fact, relational self-construal predicted relational self-enhancement uniquely, and collective self-construal predicted collective self-enhancement uniquely in addition to individual self-construal. Overall, the results provided partial support both for the culture as a

process view (Heine et al., 1999) by showing that individual self-construal is a more consistent predictor of self-enhancement across the measures, and for the culture as a content view (Kurman, 2001b) by showing the boosting effects of each self-construal on self-enhancement for the corresponding traits.

The second aim of this study was to examine the relationship between individual and collective self-construals and context specific self-enhancement. Specifically, the abstractness of trait adjectives was considered as the reason for lack of self-enhancement for the collective self-system. Contrary to the expectations, overall self-enhancement on abstract traits was equal both for those who are high on individual and high on collective self-construals. Similarly, self-enhancement for home and school context traits did not differ between the groups. Instead, self-enhancement on context-dependent overall measures was higher than the self-enhancement on abstract overall measure for both groups. This was also the case for the whole sample. That is, context-specific self-enhancement was greater than abstract self-enhancement irrespective of the self-construal.

Considering the previous findings in the literature, these results are very interesting. It should be recalled that for example, providing behavioral descriptions for a certain characteristic reduced the level of self-enhancement (Dunning et al., 1989). Assuming that providing a meaningful social context for a trait would prime ideas and memories which could facilitate the recall of specific behavioral indices for a trait, diminished levels of self-enhancement would be expected at least for people high on individual self-construal. In fact, the prevailing self-construal of the participants of this study was individual self-construal. Hence, these results can be considered as evidence of increasing level of self-enhancement for increasing level of specificity, standing in stark contrast with existing findings of increased level of

self-enhancement with increased behavioral abstraction for independent self (e.g., Kurman, & Sriram, 1997).

Even though the results failed to support the predictions regarding abstract versus context-specific self-enhancement, the fact that overall self-enhancement on all the three measures (abstract, home, and school) were equal both for those who are high on individual and high on collective self-construals indicates that self-enhancement is a universal tendency which exists in different self-systems. Although effect sizes for the interaction and between groups effects of the analyses of variance were too small to draw a very strong conclusion, the results of regression analyses also support the suggestion that self-enhancement exists in differently construed selves. Individual and collective self-construals emerged as two consistent predictors of self-enhancement in overall abstract, home, and school-context measures.

The relational self-construal on the other hand, failed to prove significant in the prediction of self-enhancement. It has not added anything above and beyond that of individual and collective self-construal to explaining self-enhancement. This was the first study that examined the relationship between relational self construal as measured by RIC and self-enhancement. Previously in self-enhancement research, Harrington and Liu (2002) utilized the RIC Scale, but they excluded the Relational subscale. Furthermore, without a very comprehensive validation study for the Turkish setting pointing to the relationships between each subscale of RIC and other relevant measures in the literature, it is hard to figure out what really differentiates between relational and collective self as measured by RIC. Therefore, the lack of a relationship between relational self and overall self-enhancement should be interpreted with caution. In fact, although the relational self-construal did not

contribute to explaining overall self-enhancement, it had unique contribution to explaining self-enhancement on relational traits.

In sum, the results of all of the analyses combined indicate that the current research partially supports both the predictions of culture as a process view (Heine et al., 1999) by showing that individual self-construal is a more consistent predictor of self-enhancement for different traits, and culture as a content view (Kurman, 2001b) by showing the boosting effect of each self-construal on self-enhancement for the corresponding desirable traits. On the other hand, the fact that both individual and collective self-construals have positive relationships with overall self-enhancement implies that self-enhancement is a tendency that exists in differently construed selves, which contradicts the predictions of culture as a process view. Therefore, the results of this within-culture study can be considered as more in line with previous research reporting similar levels of self-enhancement across different cultures (e.g., Kobayashi & Brown, 2003; Sedikides et al., 2003). Perhaps the previous studies that reported lower levels of self-enhancement for collectivist settings (e.g., Norasakkunkit & Kalick, 2002) was because of an inadequate differentiation of desirable characteristics on which different groups self-enhance. The present study provided support to the view that once such differentiation is made individual and collective selves might self-enhance to the same degree.

Since this is the first study in the self-enhancement literature in which context was systematically varied for identical personality traits, this study also makes a contribution to the existing literature by showing that self-enhancement increases with the context specificity of personality traits both for those who are high on individual and high on collective self-construal.

The current research also has important implications concerning individualism-collectivism orientations in the Turkish culture. Comparison of the three self-construals for the whole sample revealed that individual self-construal was the most highly endorsed among the three. The literature suggests greater endorsement of individualistic values among student populations compared to other segments of societies (e.g., Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990). With regard to a university population, the current study provides a comprehensive profile of urban Turkish culture with its wide-range sample. Indeed, with the idea that any characteristic peculiar to a certain university (such as achievement level, career aspirations, demographic background of the students) might affect the individualist-collectivist orientations within that particular university, five different groups were selected in order to obtain variability in self-construals across the participants.

The positive correlations among the three self-construals and the difficulty of grouping participants are also very telling by themselves, contributing to the discussion that Turkish culture is neither predominantly individualist, nor predominantly collectivist (Göregenli, 1995). Göregenli (1995) presented a large sample of Turkish participants, both college students and adults of various occupations and educational levels with Hui's (1988) Individualism-Collectivism Scale, which is a measure tapping individualism-collectivism orientations in six different relational settings (i.e., spouse, parents, relatives, neighbours, friends, and co-workers). The validation study of Göregenli (1995) revealed a predominantly collectivist orientation in certain relational settings, and a predominantly individualist orientation in others.

According to Kağıtçıbaşı (1996), most of the theorizing in self-psychology relies on the underlying assumption that interpersonal relatedness and agency are two

opposing poles of a unidimensional continuum. Consequently, in such traditional dichotomies, individualism and collectivism are conceptualized as mutually exclusive categories, increases in one implying decreases in the other. For Kağıtçıbaşı (1996) however, self-construal is best conceptualized as a two dimensional phenomenon, rather than one. These dimensions are interpersonal distance (at the two opposing poles reside separateness and relatedness), and agency (at the two poles reside autonomy and heteronomy). Accordingly, one's position in one dimension might or might not have bearing on one's position in the other dimension, for example, it is possible to be both autonomous and related. In Kağıtçıbaşı's (1996) theorizing, in industrializing societies like Turkey, traditional values of interdependence coexist with agency needs. In the family, material autonomy of members influences the socialization pattern so that agency which is functional in urban life is encouraged. At the same time however, family members are emotionally tied together. This pattern supports the development of the "autonomous-relational" self, which implies the co-existence of autonomy and interpersonal relatedness within the same self.

With a large sample of students from different universities in Istanbul, the current study seems to confirm the above argument. The difficulty of dividing participants into three groups as people having predominantly relational, individual, and collective self-construal suggests that participants might have difficulty rank ordering the three response items (relational, individual, and collective) of the RIC statements as one having more importance than the others, possibly pointing to co-existence of different dimensions within the same self.

### Limitations and Future Directions

In this study, above average effect was employed as the measure of self-enhancement. This method is criticized on several grounds by some researchers. For example, it has been argued that while making comparative judgments, what people actually engage in is only self-evaluation, not a true comparison (Klar & Giladi, 1999). It has also been claimed that it is not possible for this measure to differentiate between people who really self-enhance and those who diminish the other (Krueger, 1998; Sinha, & Krueger, 1998; for a fuller discussion of the subject see also Kwan, John, Kenny, Bond, & Robins, 2004). Nevertheless, it is a widely applied method in cross-cultural research on self-enhancement; and it has been utilized in the current study for comparison purposes.

In order to examine the influence of self-construal on different personality traits, participants were grouped as high or low on the three self-construals, and between group comparisons were carried out for the three types of traits (relational, individual, and collective). A better way of comparing the predictions of the content and the process views would be to categorize participants into three groups as people who are high on relational, individual, and collective self-construal, respectively, and compare these groups' level of self-enhancement on relational, individual, and collective traits. Unfortunately however, the present data did not allow for such a categorization. For the current sample, all three self-construal scores were correlated positively with each other; hence dividing the participants into two groups as having predominantly individual or collective self-construal, even without considering the relational self-construal, left more than two thirds of the whole sample out of the analyses. With a three-set division, such a small sample size would be left that it would be impossible to carry out the analyses. If such a division were possible

though, both between and within group comparisons among the three self-enhancement measures could be carried out. Indeed, cross-cultural and within-culture studies on self-enhancement employ both measures (e.g., Sedikides et al., 2003); and this would be an advantage for comparison purposes.

Examination of abstract and context-specific self-enhancement revealed increasing level of self-enhancement for increasing level of specificity. On the other hand, these results can be considered as a methodological artifact. In order to vary the context systematically across the three measures of self-enhancement (abstract, home, and school), the same traits were used in all three scales. Only those traits semantically applicable to different contexts as well as abstract descriptions were selected. Even though applicability to abstract description was also considered, it might be argued that applicability to different contexts makes an adjective context-dependent by definition. Therefore, it is highly possible that most of the traits used in the current study were more easily interpretable for a specific context rather than for general personality descriptions. Consequently, seeming low levels of self-enhancement on abstract traits might simply reflect the difficulty of comprehension of the meaning of these traits as abstract personality characteristics. An alternative way of comparing abstract and context-dependent self-enhancement could be to use different trait adjectives for different measures. For example, contextually invariant traits such as intelligent, creative, etc. could be used in abstract measure. It should be kept in mind however, as cross-cultural research on self-concept consistently shows (e.g., Cousins, 1989), these kinds of abstract self descriptions carry autonomous connotations which is more meaningful in the independent self-system. Therefore, in such a measure that employs different traits, confounding differential importance given to personality characteristics with context specificity, remains a possibility.

One point must be also mentioned before concluding. As the results of the regression analyses revealed, approximately 11.8 %, 12.8 %, and 10.9 % of the variance in self-enhancement on abstract, home, and school-context traits, respectively, was explained by the linear effect of self-construals. This leaves approximately 90 % of the variance in self-enhancement unexplained. Since the current sample consisted solely of university students, future studies should examine other variables that are possibly related to self-enhancement such as educational level, socio-economic status, and generation, so that a more complete picture is obtained.

### Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between self-enhancement and self-construal and perpetuated the debate between culture as a process and culture as a content view. On the one hand, by showing that each self-construal had unique contributions to self-enhancement on traits that are differentially desirable for the particular self, this study pointed to the fact that self-enhancement is a universal tendency that is expressed in different ways in different self-systems. On the other hand, individual self-construal was a consistent predictor of self-enhancement for all three types of traits, which is in line with the predictions of culture as a process view.

Drawing on the findings of the cross-cultural literature on self-concept, this study employed both abstract and context-specific self-enhancement measures in an effort to show that low levels of self-enhancement of the collective self might be due to the abstract nature of personality characteristics on which people self-enhance. Contrary to predictions, irrespective of self-construal, self-enhancement was greater for context-specific traits than for abstract traits. Nevertheless, this finding is very

important in showing that self-enhancement increases with context-specificity.

Moreover, similar levels of self-enhancement for individual and collective self-systems both on abstract and context-specific measures support the idea that self-enhancement is a basic tendency that exists universally.

## References

- Agostinelli, G., Sherman, S. J., Presson, C. C., & Chassin, L. (1992). Self-protection and self-enhancement biases in estimates of population prevalence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18(5), 631-642.
- Alicke, M. D. (1985). Global self-evaluation as determined by the desirability and controllability of trait adjectives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49(6), 1621-1630.
- Alicke, M. D., Klotz, M. L., Breitenbecher, D. L., Yurak, T. J., & Vredenburg, D. S. (1995). Personal contact, individuation, and the better than-average effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 804-825.
- Asendorpf, J. B., & Ostendorf, F. (1998). Is self-enhancement healthy? Conceptual, psychometric, and empirical analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(4), 955-966.
- Baumgardner, A. H. (1990). To know oneself is to like oneself: Self-certainty and self-affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58(6), 1062-1072.
- Bochner, S. (1994). Cross-cultural differences in the self-concept: A test of Hofstede's individualism/collectivism distinction. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25(2), 273-283.
- Bond, M. H., & Cheung, T. (1983). College students' spontaneous self-concept: The effect of culture among respondents in Hong Kong, Japan, and the United States. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14(2), 153-171.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self representations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(1), 83-93.

- Brown, J. D. (1986). Evaluations of self and others: Self-enhancement biases in social judgements. Social Cognition, 4(4), 353-376.
- Brown, J. D., & Kobayashi, C. (2002). Self-enhancement in Japan and America. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 5, 145-168.
- Campbell, J. D., Trapnell, P. D., 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(1), 141-156.
- Chang, E. C., & Asakawa, K. (2003). Cultural variations on optimistic and pessimistic bias for self versus a sibling: Is there evidence for self-enhancement in the west and self-criticism in the east when the referent group is specified? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84(3), 569-581.
- Choi, I., & Choi, Y. (2002). Culture and self-concept flexibility. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28(11), 1508-1517.
- Colvin, C. R., Block, J., & Funder, D. C. (1995). Overly positive self-evaluations and personality: Negative implications for mental health. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(6), 1152-1162.
- Cousins, S. D. (1989). Culture and self-perception in Japan and the United States. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56(1), 124-131.
- Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78(4), 791-808.
- Cross, S. E., & Morris, M. L. (2003). Getting to know you: The relational self-construal, relational cognition, and well-being. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29(4), 512-523.

- Cuixia, L., Jian, X., & Zhongfang, Y. (2003). A compromise between self-enhancement and honesty: Chinese self-evaluations on social desirability scales. Psychological Reports, 92, 291-298.
- 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(6), 1082-1090.
- Elovson, A., & Fleming, J. (1989). Rationale for multidimensional self-esteem scale scoring and weighting. Unpublished manuscript, California State University.
- Göregenli, M. (1995). Kültürümüz açısından bireycilik-toplulukçuluk eğilimleri: Bir başlangıç çalışması [Individualism-collectivism orientations in the Turkish culture: A preliminary study]. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 35, 1-14.
- Harrington, L., & Liu, J. H. (2002). Self-enhancement and attitudes toward high achievers: A bicultural view of the independent and interdependent self. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33(1), 37-55.
- Heine, S. J., Kitayama, S., & Lehman, D. R. (2001). Cultural differences in self-evaluation: Japanese readily accept negative self-relevant information. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32(4), 434-443.
- Heine, S. J., Kitayama, S., Lehman, D. R., Takata, T., Ide, E., Leung, C., & Matsumoto, H. (2001). Divergent consequences of success and failure in Japan and North America: An investigation of self-improving motivations and malleable selves. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81(4), 599-615.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1995). Cultural variation in unrealistic optimism: Does the west feel more invulnerable than the east? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(4), 595-607.

- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997). The cultural construction of self-enhancement: An examination of group-serving biases. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *72*(6), 1268-1283.
- Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? Psychological Review, *106*(4), 766-794.
- Heine, S. J., & Renshaw, K. (2002). Interjudge agreement, self-enhancement, and liking: Cross-cultural divergences. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *28*(5), 578-587.
- Heine, S. J., Takata, T., & Lehman, D. R. (2000). Beyond self-presentation: Evidence for self-criticism among Japanese. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *26*(1), 71-78.
- Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. Journal of Research in Personality, *22*, 17-36.
- Hymes, R. W., & Akiyama, M. M. (1991). Depression and self-enhancement among Japanese and American students. The Journal of Social Psychology, *131*(3), 321-324.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1996). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. European Psychologist, *1*(3), 180-186.
- Kanagawa, C., Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (2001). "Who am I?" The cultural psychology of the conceptual self. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *27*(1), 90-103.
- Kashima, E. S., & Hardie, E. A. (2000). The development and validation of the Relational, Individual, and Collective self-aspects (RIC) Scale. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, *3*, 19-48.

- Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S-C, Gelfand, M. J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and the self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *69*(5), 925-937.
- Kitayama, S., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Yin and yang of the Japanese self: The cultural psychology of personality coherence. In D. Cervone & Y. Shoda (Eds.), The coherence of personality: Social-cognitive bases of consistency, variability, and organization. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *72*(6), 1245-1267.
- Klar, Y., & Giladi, E. E. (1999). Are most people happier than their peers, or are they just happy? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *25*(5), 585-594.
- Kobayashi, C., & Brown, J. D. (2003). Self-esteem and self-enhancement in Japan and America. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *34*(5), 567-580.
- Krueger, J. (1998). Enhancement bias in descriptions of self and others. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *24*(5), 505-516.
- Kuhn, M. H., & McPartland, T. S. (1954). An empirical investigation of self-attitudes. American Sociological Review, *19*, 68-76.
- Kurman, J. (2001a). Is self-enhancement related to modesty or to individualism-collectivism? A test with four Israeli groups. Asian Journal of social Psychology, *4*, 225-237.
- Kurman, J. (2001b). Self-enhancement: Is it restricted to individualistic cultures? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *27*(12), 1705-1716.

- Kurman, J. (2003). Why is self-enhancement low in certain collectivist cultures? An investigation of two competing explanations. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34(5), 496-510.
- Kurman, J., & Eshel, Y. (1998). Self-enhancement, generality level of self-evaluation, and emotional adjustment. The Journal of Social Psychology, 138(5), 549-563.
- Kurman, J., & Sriram, N. (1997). Self-enhancement, generality of self-evaluation, and affectivity in Israel and Singapore. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28(4), 421-441.
- Kurman, J., & Sriram, N. (2002). Interrelationships among vertical and horizontal collectivism, modesty, and self-enhancement. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33(1), 71-86.
- Kurman, J., Yoshihara-Tanaka, C., & Elkoshi, T. (2003). Is self-enhancement negatively related to constructive self-criticism? Self-enhancement and self-criticism in Israel and in Japan. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34(1), 24-37.
- Kwan, V. S. Y., John, O. P., Kenny, D. A., Bond, M. H., & Robins, R. W. (2004). Reconceptualizing individual differences in self-enhancement bias: An interpersonal approach. Psychological Review, 111(1), 94-110.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98(2), 224-253.
- Muramoto, Y. (2003). An indirect self-enhancement in relationship among Japanese. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34(5), 552-566.

- Norasakkunkit, V., & Kalick, S. M. (2002). Culture, ethnicity, and emotional distress measures: The role of self-construal and self-enhancement. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *33*(1), 56-70.
- Pelham, B. W., & Swann, W. B. (1989). From self-conception to self-worth: On the sources and structure of global self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *57*(4), 672-680.
- Regan, P. C., Snyder, M., Kassin, S. M. (1995). Unrealistic optimism: Self-enhancement or person positivity? Personality and Social Psychology, *21*(10), 1073-1082.
- Rhee, E., Uleman, J. S., Lee, H. K., & Roman, R. J. (1995). Spontaneous self-descriptions and ethnic identities in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *69*(1), 142-152.
- Sarıbay, S. A. (2002). Individualism-collectivism, self-esteem, and alternative indices of self-certainty. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Sedikides, C. (1993). Assessment, enhancement, and verification determinants of the self-evaluation process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *65*(2), 317-338.
- Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *84*(1), 60-79.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *20*(5), 580-591.

- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. Cross Cultural Research – The Journal of Comparative Social Science, 29, 240-275.
- Sinha, R. R., & Krueger, J. (1998). Idiographic self-evaluation and bias. Journal of Research in Personality, 32, 131-155.
- Somer, O. (1998). Türkçe’de kişilik özelliği tanımlayan sıfatların yapısı ve beş factor modeli [The structure of trait descriptive adjectives in Turkish language and the five-factor model]. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 42, 17-32.
- Suh, E. M. (2002). Culture, identity consistency, and subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(6), 1378-1391.
- Sunar, D. G., İnelman, K., Israel, E., Karabatı, S., Karamolla, N., & Üner, S. (1994). Kendi kavramı ve özdeğer: Gruplar arası bir karşılaştırma (Self-concept and self-esteem: A comparison between groups). Paper presented at the VIII. National Psychology Congress, September 21-23, 1994, İzmir, Turkey.
- Taris, T. W. (1999). Describing behaviours of self and others: Self-enhancing beliefs and language abstraction level. European Journal of Social Psychology, 29, 391-396.
- Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, 103(2), 193-210.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 1006-1020.
- Weinstein, N. D. (1980). Unrealistic optimism about future life events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38(5), 806-820.

- Yamaguchi, S. (1994). Collectivism among the Japanese: A perspective from the self. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 175-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yamaguchi, S., Kuhlman, D. M., & Sugimori, S. (1995). Personality correlates of allocentric tendencies in individualist and collectivist cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26(6), 658-672.
- Yik, M. S. M., & Bond, M. H. (1993). Exploring the dimensions of Chinese person perception with indigenous and imported constructs: Creating a culturally balanced scale. International Journal of Psychology, 28(1), 75-95.
- Yik, M. S. M., Bond, M. H., & Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Do Chinese self-enhance or self-efface? It's a matter of domain. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24(4), 399-406.

## Appendices

## APPENDIX A: YÖNERGE VE DEMOGRAFİK SORULAR

Anket no:
-----------

Bu bir master tez çalışması için yapılan bir araştırmadır. Size verilen bu anket çeşitli bölümlerden oluşmaktadır. Her sayfanın başında, soruları nasıl cevaplandıracağınızı anlatan yönergeleri lütfen dikkatli bir şekilde okuyunuz. Bu anketteki soruların doğru cevapları yoktur. Önemli olan sizin soruları dürüst olarak cevaplandırıp anketi eksiksiz bir şekilde doldurmanızdır. Vereceğiniz cevaplar araştırmacı dışında kimse tarafından görülmeyecektir. Cevapların kime ait olduğunun anlaşılması için sizden isminiz istenmemektedir. Araştırmaya katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederiz.

1. Cinsiyetiniz

Kadın

Erkek

2. Yaşınız: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Üniversiteniz: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Bölümünüz: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B: İLİŞKİSEL, BİREYCI VE TOPLULUKÇU BENLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki on sorunun, üçer şikkın sizi ne kadar doğru tarif ettiği, size ne kadar uygun olduğu açısından değerlendiriniz. Değerlendirmenizi aşağıdaki ölçeğe göre, her şikkın önündeki yere 1'den 7'ye kadar bir rakam yazarak yapınız.

**Beni hiç tarif etmiyor  
ediyor**

**Beni tam tarif**

**Bana hiç uymuyor**      1   2   3   4   5   6   7

**Bana tam  
uyuyor**

1- Önemli bir kişisel karar almak durumunda kaldığımda,

\_\_\_ a- birlikte olduğum kişi veya en yakın arkadaşım ile konuşurum.

\_\_\_ b- kendime gerçekten en çok ne yapmak istediğimi sorarım.

\_\_\_ c- ailemle ve akrabalarım ile konuşurum.

2- Bence hayatta en önemli şey,

\_\_\_ a- ait olduğum gurubun iyiliği için çalışmaktır.

\_\_\_ b- tutarlı ve kendime karşı dürüst olmaktır.

\_\_\_ c- benim için önemli olan insanlarla iyi ilişkiler içinde olmaktır.

3- Çocuklarıma şunları öğrettirdim:

\_\_\_ a- ait olduğu gruba sadık olmayı.

\_\_\_ b- arkadaşlarını önemsemeyi ve onlara karşı duyarlı olmayı.

\_\_\_ c- kendilerini bilmeyi ve birey olarak potansiyellerini geliştirmeyi.

4- Kendimi şöyle bir insan olarak görürüm:

\_\_\_ a- iyi bir eş veya arkadaş.

\_\_\_ b- grubumun iy bir üyesi.

\_\_\_ c- iradeli biri.

5- En çok önemsedığım şey:

\_\_\_ a- kendimle olan ilişkim.

\_\_\_ b- belli bir insanla olan ilişkim.

\_\_\_ c- grubumla ilişkim.

6- Bir kişiyi bir işyeri için iyi bir çalışan olarak tanımlarım, eğer

- \_\_\_ a- kendisine verilen işle ilgili kişisel sorumluluk duyuyorsa.
- \_\_\_ b- çalışma arkadaşlarıyla iyi anlaşılıyor ve işbirliği yapıyorsa.
- \_\_\_ c- çalışma gurubunun ve içinde bulunduğu kurumun iyiliği için çalışıyorsa.

7- Bence onurlu bir insan olmanın yolu

- \_\_\_ a- kişisel ilişkisi olan insanlara sadık olmaktır.
- \_\_\_ b- ait olduğu gruplara (aile, çalışma grubu, dini ve sosyal gruplar) sadık olmaktır.
- \_\_\_ c- kendisiyle çelişmemektir.

8- Beni en çok tatmin eden:

- \_\_\_ a- grubum (okul, klüp, mahalle, vb.) için bir şeyler yapmaktır.
- \_\_\_ b- önemsedğim bir kimse için bir şeyler yapmaktır.
- \_\_\_ c- kendim için bir şeyler yapmaktır.

9- Gurur duyardım eğer,

- \_\_\_ a- yakın bir arkadaşım yaptığı bir işten dolayı gazetede övülürse.
- \_\_\_ b- grubum yaptığı bir işten dolayı gazetede övülürse.
- \_\_\_ c- yaptığım bir şeyden dolayı gazetede övülürsem.

10- Bir konsere gittiğimde,

- \_\_\_ a- müzikten keyif almanın çok kişisel bir deneyim olduğunu düşünürüm.
- \_\_\_ b- bana eşlik eden insanlar (eş, arkadaş, konuk) keyif alırsa ben de keyif alırım.
- \_\_\_ c- birlikte olduğum grubun bir parçası olmaktan keyif alırım.

## APPENDIX C: SOYUT BENLİK GÜÇLENDİRME ENVANTERİ

Aşağıda bir insanı tanımlamada kullanılabilecek bazı kişilik özellikleri sıralanmıştır. Sizden istediğimiz, kendinizi okulunuzdaki sizinle aynı cinsiyetteki diğer öğrencilerle karşılaştırmanız ve bu özelliklerin sizde ne kadar bulunduğunu değerlendirmenizdir. Her bir kişilik özelliğinin diğer öğrencilerle karşılaştırıldığında sizi genel olarak ne kadar iyi tanımladığını ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz. Lütfen hiç bir maddeyi boş bırakmayınız.

	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
	bu özellik başkalarına göre bende çok daha az var			bu özellik bende başkalarıyla eşit derecede var	bu özellik başkalarına göre bende çok daha fazla var		
1. Tedbirli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
2. İşbirliğine yatkın	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
3. Dikkatli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
4. Pratik	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
5. Gayretli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
6. Cesur	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
7. Etkili	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
8. Konuşkan	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
9. Sade	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
10. Serinkanlı	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
11. Coşkulu	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
12. Huzurlu	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
13. Düzenli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
14. Özverili	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
15. Hareketli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
16. Prensipte sahibi	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
17. Hazırcevap	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
18. Açıksözlü	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

## APPENDIX D: BAĞLAM HAZIRLAMA ALIŞTIRMASI - EV

Aşağıda çeşitli durumlar tarif edilmiştir. Sizden, bu durumları hayal etmenizi ve ardından gelen soruları cevaplamanızı istiyoruz. Her soruyu, ayrılan boş satırları geçmeyecek şekilde **kısaca** cevaplayınız. Soruların doğru cevapları bulunmamaktadır. Önemli olan soruları dürüst olarak cevaplandırıp, hiç bir soruyu atlamamanızdır.

Şu anda evinizde, ailenizle birlikte olduğunuzu hayal edin. Eğer ailenizle birlikte yaşamıyorsanız, onlarla birlikte olduğunuz zamanları hayal edin. Odaları, eşyaları, size tanıdık gelen herşeyi gözünüzde canlandırmaya çalışın.

Evin salonunda ya da oturma odasında ne tür eşyalar var, ne renkteler?

---



---

Varsa annenizi, babanızı, kardeşlerinizi, ya da diğer aile fertlerini hayal edin.

Evde sizinle birlikte kaç kişi oturuyor? Lütfen her bir aile ferdinin size olan akrabalık durumunu belirtiniz (örneğin, babaanne, kızkardeş, büyükbaba gibi).

---



---

Sıradan bir akşam, genelde birlikte yaptığınız şeyleri düşünün (örneğin yemek yemek, TV izlemek gibi).

Şu anda ailenizin yanında bir akşam geçiriyor olsaydınız hep birlikte ne yapıyor olurdunuz?

---



---

Duyduğunuz sesleri, konuşmaları, düşüncelerinizi şu anda oradaymış gibi kafanızda canlandırmaya çalışın.

Tüm aile biraradayken genellikle hangi konular hakkında konuşursunuz? Lütfen kısaca tarif ediniz.

---



---



---

## APPENDIX E: MANİPULASYON KONTROLÜ - EV

Yukarıdaki soruları cevaplandırırken aile ortamınız kafanızda ne kadar canlandı?

Lütfen aşağıda belirtiniz:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
aile ortamım kafamda <b>hiç</b> canlanmadı						aile ortamım kafamda <b>çok net</b> canlandı

Yukarıdaki soruları cevaplandırırken kendinizi ne kadar evinizde, ailenizin yanında hissettiniz? Lütfen aşağıda belirtiniz:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç aileleymiş gibi hissetmedim						Aynen ailemin yanındaymış gibi hissettim

## APPENDIX F: BAĞLAM BAĞIMLI BENLİK GÜÇLENDİRME ENVANTERİ - EV

Aşağıda bir insanı tanımlamada kullanılacak bazı kişilik özellikleri sıralanmıştır. Sizden istediğimiz, kendinizi okulunuzdaki sizinle aynı cinsiyetteki diğer öğrencilerle karşılaştırmanız ve bu özelliklerin sizde ne kadar bulunduğunu değerlendirmenizdir. Her bir kişilik özelliğinin diğer öğrencilerle karşılaştırıldığında sizi ne kadar iyi tanımladığını ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz. Bu karşılaştırmayı yaparken kendinizi genel halinizle değil, **evde, ailenizin yanında** olduğunuz şekilde (**evde, ailenizin yanında nasılsanız öyle**) düşünün. Lütfen hiç bir maddeyi boş bırakmayınız.

	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
bu özellik başkalarına göre bende bende çok daha az var				bu özellik bende başkalarıyla eşit derecede var			bu özellik başkalarına göre çok daha fazla var
1. Tedbirli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
2. İşbirliğine yatkın	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
3. Dikkatli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
4. Pratik	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
5. Gayretli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
6. Cesur	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
7. Etkili	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
8. Konuşkan	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
9. Sade	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
10. Serinkanlı	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
11. Coşkulu	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
12. Huzurlu	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
13. Düzenli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
14. Özverili	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
15. Hareketli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
16. Prensip sahibi	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
17. Hazırcevap	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
18. Açıksözlü	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

## APPENDIX G: BAĞLAM HAZIRLAMA ALIŞTIRMASI - OKUL

Aşağıda çeşitli durumlar tarif edilmiştir. Sizden, bu durumları hayal etmenizi ve ardından gelen soruları cevaplamanızı istiyoruz. Her soruyu, ayrılan boş satırları geçmeyecek şekilde **kısaca** cevaplayınız. Soruların doğru cevapları bulunmamaktadır. Önemli olan soruları dürüst olarak cevaplandırıp, hiç bir soruyu atlamamanızdır.

Sıradan bir okul günü, derse girmek üzere kampüste yürüdüğünüzü hayal edin. Binaları, varsa ağaçları, size tanıdık gelen şeyleri gözünüzde canlandırmaya çalışın. Kendinizi nerede hayal ediyorsunuz? Hangi binaya girmek üzeresiniz? Etrafınızda neler var?

---



---



---

Derse giderken, okulda sık sık biraraya geldiğiniz arkadaşlarınızla karşılaştığınızı hayal edin. Okulda genellikle beraber vakit geçirdiğiniz arkadaş grubunuz kaç kişiden oluşuyor? Bu kişilerin cinsiyetleri ne? Kısaca belirtiniz.

---



---

Derse girmeden önce genelde yaptığınız şeyleri düşünün (örneğin kantine uğramak, bir şeyler yeyip içmek, ya da arkadaşlarınızla sohbet etmek gibi).

Farz edin ki derse girmenize daha vakit var; ne yapıyor olurdunuz?

---



---



---

Okul arkadaşlarınızla bir aradasınız. Duyduğunuz sesleri, konuşmaları, düşüncelerinizi şu anda oradaymış gibi kafanızda canlandırmaya çalışın. Okul arkadaşlarınızla genellikle neler hakkında konuşursunuz? Lütfen kısaca tarif ediniz.

---



---



---

## APPENDIX H: MANİPULASYON KONTROLÜ - OKUL

Yukarıdaki soruları cevaplandırırken okul ortamınız kafanızda ne kadar canlandı?  
Lütfen aşağıda belirtiniz:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
okul ortamım kafamda <b>hiç</b> canlanmadı						okul ortamım kafamda <b>çok net</b> canlandı

Yukarıdaki soruları cevaplandırırken kendinizi ne kadar okulda, arkadaşlarınızın yanında hissettiniz? Lütfen aşağıda belirtiniz:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç arkadaşlarımlaymış gibi hissetmedim						Aynen arkadaşlarımlaymış yanındaymış gibi hissettim

APPENDIX I: BAĞLAM BAĞIMLI BENLİK GÜÇLENDİRME ENVANTERİ -  
OKUL

Aşağıda bir insanı tanımlamada kullanılabilecek bazı kişilik özellikleri sıralanmıştır. Sizden istediğimiz, kendinizi okulunuzdaki sizinle aynı cinsiyetteki diğer öğrencilerle karşılaştırmanız ve bu özelliklerin sizde ne kadar bulunduğunu değerlendirmenizdir. Her bir kişilik özelliğinin diğer öğrencilerle karşılaştırıldığında sizi ne kadar iyi tanımladığını ölçeği kullanarak belirtiniz. Bu karşılaştırmayı yaparken kendinizi genel halinizle değil, **okulda, arkadaşlarınızın yanında** olduğunuz şekilde (**okulda, arkadaşlarınızın yanında nasılsanız öyle**) düşünün. Lütfen hiç bir maddeyi boş bırakmayınız.

	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
bu özellik başkalarına göre bende çok <b>daha az</b> var				bu özellik bende başkalarıyla eşit derecede var			bu özellik başkalarına göre bende çok daha <b>fazla</b> var
1. Tedbirli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
2. İşbirliğine yatkın	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
3. Dikkatli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
4. Pratik	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
5. Gayretli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
6. Cesur	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
7. Etkili	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
8. Konuşkan	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
9. Sade	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
10. Serinkanlı	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
11. Coşkulu	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
12. Huzurlu	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
13. Düzenli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
14. Özverili	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
15. Hareketli	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
16. Prensipten sahibi	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
17. Hazırcevap	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
18. Açıksözlü	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

## APPENDIX J: 1) PILOT STUDY

In order to differentiate among personality characteristics that are meaningful for people high on individual, relational, and collective self-construals, a pilot study was conducted with 116 Boğaziçi University students (81 females, 30 males). Five participants did not report gender. The mean age was 20.15 ( $SD = 1.63$ ) ranging from 18 to 27. Participants first filled out the RIC scale (Kashima & Hardie, 2000), then rated a list of trait adjectives as will be described below.

For this pilot research, Cronbach's alpha of the relational, individual, and the collective subscales of RIC was .77, .69, and .87, respectively. These alpha levels are comparable to those reported by Fişek (2003, personal communication).

In order to create the list of trait adjectives to measure self-enhancement, 164 positively valenced personality characteristics were selected from a list of Turkish trait adjectives of the five-factor model (Somer, 1998). Additional 22 positively valenced trait adjectives that were not applicable to the five factor model were also added. Participants were asked to rate a total of 185 items in terms of the importance of having each personality characteristic on a scale ranging from 1 (not important at all) to 7 (very important) (the trait list is presented at the end of this Appendix, section 2).

Three selection criteria were employed in choosing among the items. The first criterion was that the importance scores of personality characteristic be positively correlated with one self-construal score but not with others. With regard to relational traits, a total of 17 items that were correlated positively with the relational self-construal score but were not correlated with the other two self-construals emerged as a possible pool of relational self-enhancement items. Intercorrelations among these items and self-construal scores are presented in Table 21.

Because the same items were going to be used both in the abstract and the context-specific self-enhancement measures, applicability to context was the second selection criterion. Some personality characteristics are contextually more variable than others, yet others are more of a trait type and not applicable to different contexts. For example, adjectives like creative, attractive, and intelligent are not context dependent. Expressions like “I’m intelligent in general, but I’m not usually intelligent at home” contradict with laymen theories of personality, hence seems unnatural. In order to satisfy this criterion, the initial pool of 17 relational items were presented to 3 raters who were asked to rate each item’s applicability to home and school contexts in a yes-no format. Nine personality characteristics were rated as applicable to different contexts by at least 2 of the 3 raters. These were *dikkatli* (careful), *hareketli* (active), *konuskan* (talkative), *dengeli* (balanced), *güzel konuşan* (talented as a speaker), *huzurlu* (serene), *coşkulu* (ebullient), *özverili* (self-sacrificing), and *eğlenceli* (amusing).

The third selection criterion was the mean importance score and the standard deviation of each item. To obtain comparable desirability levels among the three groups of personality characteristics (i.e., relational, individual, and collective), items with low mean importance scores were not included. Similarly, items with standard deviations lower than .95 were not eligible. Means and standard deviations of all 17 relational items are presented in Table 22.

Table 21

Intercorrelations among the Relational Personality Characteristics and Self-Construal Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. Dikkatli	-	.38**	.04	.06	.44**	.26**	.25**	.15	.21*	.11	.29**	.15	.02	.13	.07	.12	.15	.19*	.11	.12
2. Hareketli		-	.02	.46**	.15	.48**	.28**	.48**	.46**	.14	.36**	.46**	.49**	.42**	.05	.44**	.44**	.20*	.08	.13
3. Esnek			-	.07	.21*	.13	.22*	-.01	-.04	.25**	.15	-.05	-.02	-.05	.37**	.16	.17	.20*	.02	.07
4. Konuşkan				-	.04	.29**	.21*	.21*	.23*	.13	.15	.23*	.54**	.28**	-.02	.52	.33	.19*	.05	.10
5. Dengeli					-	.05	.01	.01	.13	.24**	.30**	-.03	.06	-.02	.22*	.05	.03	.24*	.16	.09
6. Maceracı						-	.39**	.36**	.27**	.09	.17	.34**	.41**	.35**	.13	.49**	.43**	.21*	.14	.08
7. Hayal gücü kuvvetli							-	.25**	.23*	.16	.18	.27**	.21*	.30**	.33**	.31**	.33**	.23*	.18	.07
8. Çekici								-	.54**	.13	.13	.57**	.33**	.56**	.05	.41**	.45**	.22*	.07	-.06
9. Güzel konuşan									-	.30**	.19*	.48**	.33**	.43**	.12	.28**	.35**	.26**	.14	.06
10. Vicdanlı										-	.37**	.12	.15	.10	.40**	.12	.20	.27**	-.06	.18
11. Huzurlu											-	.10	.29**	.10	.22*	.31	.26**	.22*	.15	.14
12. İlgi çekici												-	.32**	.74**	.13	.38**	.48**	.23*	.11	-.01
13. Coşkulu													-	.38**	.12	.46**	.47**	.26**	.12	.11
14. Çarpıcı														-	.12	.42**	.43**	.26**	.11	-.02
15. Özverili															-	.11	.32**	.23*	-.03	.15
16. Eğlenceli																-	.67**	.24**	.13	.11
17. Sempatik																	-	.34**	.17	.17
18. RIC_Relational																		-	.33*	.58**
19. RIC_Individual																			-	.26**
20. RIC_Collective																				-

Note. \*p &lt; .05 (2-tailed)

\*\*p &lt; .01 (2-tailed)

Table 22

Descriptive Characteristics of the Relational Items

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Actual Range of Scores
Dikkatli	5.66	1.05	3-7
Hareketli	5.28	1.17	1-7
Esnek	5.72	0.98	3-7
Konuşkan	5.20	1.28	2-7
Dengeli	6.05	0.93	3-7
Maceracı	4.54	1.54	1-7
Hayal gücü kuvvetli	5.16	1.58	1-7
Çekici	4.97	1.54	1-7
Güzel konuşan	5.78	1.17	1-7
Vicdanlı	6.12	1.10	2-7
Huzurlu	5.78	1.14	2-7
İlgi çekici	5.14	1.46	1-7
Coşkulu	5.37	1.12	2-7
Çarpıcı	4.71	1.45	1-7
Özverili	5.77	1.06	2-7
Eğlenceli	5.74	1.01	3-7
Sempatik	5.85	1.07	2-7

Considering all the criteria, 6 personality characteristics were selected to form the relational subscale of the self-enhancement measure. These are *dikkatli* (careful), *hareketli* (active), *konuşkan* (talkative), *huzurlu* (serene), *coşkulu* (ebullient), and *özverili* (self-sacrificed).

With regard to individual traits, fourteen items that were correlated positively with the individual self-construal score but were not correlated with the other two self-construals formed the pool of individual self-enhancement items.

Intercorrelations among these items and self-construal scores are presented in Table

Table 23

Intercorrelations among the Individual Personality Characteristics and Self-Construal Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Girişken	-	.43**	.30**	.24**	.19*	.30**	.26**	.26**	.12	.38**	.35**	.26**	.42**	.45**	.10	.21*	.17
2. Geniş görüşlü		-	.31**	.34**	.14	.42**	.17	.06	.15	.27**	.27**	.26**	.44**	.23*	.08	.22*	.01
3. Serinkanlı			-	.27**	.24**	.21*	.09	.08	.20*	.33**	.37**	.28**	.37**	.37**	.02	.19*	-.05
4. Yenilikçi				-	.40**	.54**	.31**	.22*	.19*	.36**	.33**	.45**	.46**	.45**	.11	.27*	.04
5. Modern					-	.28**	.26**	.08	.14	.44**	.36**	.07	.57**	.31**	.17	.34**	.12
6. Yaratıcı						-	.25**	.08	.18	.35**	.30**	.29**	.45**	.41**	.11	.27**	.05
7. Hazırcevap							-	.12	.08	.34**	.34**	.05	.39**	.43**	.10	.21*	.09
8. Prensip sahibi								-	.08	.18	.04	.29**	.14	.31**	.07	.20*	.16
9. Açık sözlü									-	.15	.17	.20*	.16	.19*	.10	.20*	.16
10. Pratik										-	.31**	.35**	.48**	.46**	.18	.21*	.14
11. Etkili											-	.24**	.40**	.38**	.09	.20*	.07
12. Araştırmacı												-	.23*	.38**	.15	.21*	.18
13. İleri görüşlü													-	.39**	.14	.40**	.06
14. Aktif														-	.11	.30**	.15
15. RIC_Relational															-	.33**	.58**
16. RIC_Individual																-	.26**
17. RIC_Collective																	-

Note. \* $p \leq .05$  (2-tailed)\*\* $p < .01$  (2-tailed)

Among these 14 items, 8 were rated as applicable to different contexts by at least 2 of the 3 raters. These 8 personality characteristics were *girişken* (assertive), *serinkanlı* (cool-headed), *hazırcevap* (good at repartee), *prensip sahibi* (principled), *açık sözlü* (frank), *pratik* (practical), *etkili* (effective), and *aktif* (dynamic).

Considering also the mean importance scores and the standard deviations of these items (see Table 24) 6 personality characteristics were selected to form the individual subscale of the self-enhancement measure. These are *serinkanlı* (cool-headed), *hazırcevap* (good at repartee), *prensip sahibi* (principled), *açık sözlü* (frank), *pratik* (practical), and *etkili* (effective).

Table 24

Descriptive Characteristics of the Individual Items

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Actual Range of Scores
Girişken	5.97	0.98	3-7
Geniş görüşlü	6.44	0.79	3-7
Serinkanlı	5.68	1.12	2-7
Yenilikçi	5.90	0.94	3-7
Modern	5.96	1.09	2-7
Yaratıcı	5.91	1.02	2-7
Hazırcevap	4.59	1.52	1-7
Prensip sahibi	5.41	1.33	2-7
Açık sözlü	6.09	0.95	3-7
Pratik	5.65	1.08	3-7
Etkili	5.65	1.20	2-7
Araştırmacı	5.46	1.32	1-7
İleri görüşlü	6.13	0.90	3-7
Aktif	5.78	0.99	3-7

Regarding the collective traits, a total of 22 items that were correlated positively with the collective self-construal score but were not correlated with the other two self-construals formed the possible pool of collective self-enhancement items. Intercorrelations among these items and self-construal scores are presented in Table 25.

Among these 22 items, 16 were rated as applicable to different contexts by at least 2 of the 3 raters. These 16 personality characteristics were *bağımlı* (dependent), *tedbirli* (prudent), *otoriter* (authoritarian), *tutucu* (conventional), *kuralcı* (conformist), *sade* (plain), *mücadeleci* (resistant), *geleneksel* (traditionalist), *cesur* (courageous), *aklı başında* (sensible), *gayretli* (diligent), *düzenli* (tidy), *işbirliğine yatkın* (cooperative), *muhafazakar* (conservative), *problemsiz* (trouble-free), and *mazbut* (a person of a reclusive-conservative life).

Descriptive characteristics of the collective items are presented in Table 26. As can be seen in Table 26, unlike the individual and relational item pools, there are many items in the collective pool with mean importance scores lower than 4, and standard deviations greater than 1.5. These items with extreme scores were not eligible.

Table 25

## Intercorrelations among the Collective Personality Characteristics and Self-Constraint Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1. Bağımlı	-	.03	.19*	.24*	.40*	.23*	.17	.13	.40**	.22*	.14	.23*	.13	.12	.31**	.13	.15	.01	.04	.37**	-.05	.24*	.04	.03	.20*
2. Adil		-	.32**	.06	-.00	.11	.20*	.14	.12	.20*	.15	.28**	.19*	.29**	.17	.29**	.23	.16	-.02	.06	.04	.08	.17	.16	.29**
3. Tedbirli			-	.40**	.15	.40**	.11	.40**	.21*	.45**	.29**	.44**	.45**	.43**	.43**	.38**	.50**	.44**	.29**	.24**	.13	.04	.10	.13	.23*
4. Otoriter				-	.27**	.56**	.06	.24*	.06	.25**	.35**	.32**	.39**	.29*	.19*	.27**	.24**	.26**	.37**	.26**	.10	-.00	.09	.10	.19*
5. Tutucu					-	.33**	.17	.23*	.48**	.22*	.17	.24**	.10	.18	.19*	.23*	-.04	-.01	.12	.61**	.09	.28**	.071	-.03	.21*
6. Kuralcı						-	.18	.25**	.31**	.30**	.27**	.33**	.26**	.29**	.32**	.40**	.19*	-.18	.29**	.36**	.12	.17	.09	.12	.26**
7. Sade							-	.10	.19*	.24*	.05	.21*	.10	.13	.20*	.24*	.12	.10	-.06	.15	.19*	.11	.17	-.07	.21*
8. Mücadeleci								-	.19*	.24**	.38**	.42**	.25**	.37**	.25**	.39**	.31**	.29**	.35**	.15	.17	.11	.02	.14	.28**
9. Geleneksel									-	.24**	.14	.32**	.06	.20*	.26**	.20*	.10	.08	.02	.61**	.01	.10	.14	-.13	.29**
10. Tutumlu										-	.15	.39**	.26**	.28**	.44**	.40**	.29**	.30**	.21*	.24**	.28**	.13	.11	.17	.35**
11. Cesur											-	.36**	.31**	.26**	.20*	.34**	.24*	.30**	.37**	.20*	.10	.12	.18	.10	.21*
12. Akli başında												-	.10	.26**	.43**	.38**	.33**	.38**	.14	.29**	.19*	.18	.12	.12	.22*
13. Lider ruhlu													-	.63**	.37**	.40**	.42**	.35**	.44**	.08	.06	.06	.07	.17	.21*
14. Gayretli														-	.37**	.64**	.46**	.28**	.34**	.11	.04	.09	.03	.04	.21*
15. Düzenli															-	.46**	.39**	.30**	.20*	.31	.21*	.33**	.14	.14	.26**
16. Azimli																-	.43**	.23*	.37**	.21*	.14	.19	.17	.13	.31**
17. İşbirliğine yatkın																	-	.48**	.31**	.04	.13	.06	.14	.16	.24**
18. Gerçekçi																		-	.34	-.01	.17	-.03	-.03	.12	.20*
19. Rekabetçi																			-	.05	.22*	.04	.07	.18	.23*
20. Muhafazakar																				-	.13	.18	.15	-.15	.22*
21. Problemsiz																					-	.12	.16	.16	.24**
22. Mazbut																						-	.15	.09	.35**
23. RIC_Relational																							-	.33**	.58**
24. RIC_Individual																								-	.26**
25. RIC_Collective																									-

Note. \*p &lt; .05 (2-tailed)

\*\*p &lt; .01 (2-tailed)

Table 26

Descriptive Characteristics of the Collective Items

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Actual Range of Scores
Bağımlı	2.89	1.73	1-7
Adil	6.59	0.63	4-7
Tedbirli	5.55	1.13	3-7
Otoriter	3.78	1.62	1-7
Tutucu	2.20	1.27	1-6
Kuralcı	3.49	1.48	1-7
Sade	4.96	1.41	1-7
Mücadeleci	5.74	1.12	1-7
Geleneksel	3.26	1.52	1-7
Tutumlu	4.99	1.13	1-7
Cesur	5.57	1.13	2-7
Aklı başında	6.30	0.97	1-7
Lider ruhlu	4.86	1.43	1-7
Gayretli	6.08	1.04	2-7
Düzenli	5.18	1.53	1-7
Azimli	5.73	1.19	2-7
İşbirliğine yatkın	5.51	1.12	3-7
Gerçekçi	5.72	1.17	2-7
Rekabetçi	4.36	1.67	1-7
Muhafazakar	2.56	1.52	1-7
Problemsiz	4.38	1.58	1-7
Mazbut	3.15	1.32	1-7

Considering all the criteria, 6 personality characteristics were selected to form the collective subscale of the self-enhancement measure. These are *tedbirli*(prudent), *sade*(plain), *cesur*(courageous), *gayretli*(diligent), *düzenli*(tidy), and *işbirliğine yatkın*(cooperative).

First, separate reliability analyses were conducted for the relational, individual and collective self-enhancement scales. Cronbach's alpha of the relational, individual and collective scales were .65, .58, and .68, respectively. Cronbach's alpha for the full scale was .83. Second, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean desirability levels of the three groups of items. Main effect of the repeated factor was not significant,  $F(2, 230) = .263$ ,  $p = .769$ , indicating that the desirability level of relational ( $M = 5.51$ ), individual ( $M = 5.51$ ), and collective ( $M = 5.47$ ) items were comparable.

The order of the items was completely randomized before using the scale in the main study.

## APPENDIX J: 2) SIFAT LİSTESİ

Aşağıda bir insanı tanımlamada kullanılacak bazı kişilik özellikleri maddeler halinde sıralanmıştır. Lütfen **asağıda sıralanmış kişilik özelliklerinin bir insanda bulunmasının SIZCE NE KADAR ÖNEMLİ olduğunu**, her maddenin yanındaki ölçeği kullanarak işaretleyiniz. Lütfen hiç bir maddeyi boş bırakmayınız. Araştırmamıza katıldığınız için teşekkür ederiz.

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>		
hiç önemli değil							çok önemli		
1. Sessiz			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Dayanıklı			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. İlmli			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Çekingen			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Heyecanlı			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. İçedönük			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Hayalci			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Girişken			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Bağımlı			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Atılgan			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Geniş görüşlü			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Canlı			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Adil			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Mütevazı			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Canayakın			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Serinkanlı			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Sosyal			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Kendini tanıyan			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Fedakar			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Sanatçı ruhlu			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Sıcak			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Arkadaş canlısı			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Çalışkan			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Duygularımı ifade eden			1	2	3	4	5	6	7

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
hiç önemli değil						çok önemli	
25. Karizmatik	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Dikkatli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Hareketli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Sorumluluk sahibi	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Kontrollü	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Hoşgörülü	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Bağımsız	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. Faal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. Tedbirli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Acımasız	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. Ciddi	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. Açık	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. Yenilikçi	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. Gözüpek	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. Değişikliğe açık	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. Modern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. Yaratıcı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. Esnek	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. Delidolu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. Konuşkan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. Dengeli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. Kapalı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. Sevimli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. Orjinal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. Hazırcevap	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. Otoriter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. Dürüst	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52. Tutucu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53. Samimi	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54. Maceracı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	
hiç önemli değil						çok önemli	
55. Utangaç	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56. Hayal gücü kuvvetli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
57. Şakacı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
58. Kuralcı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
59. Açık göz	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60. Değişikliği seven	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
61. Sade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62. Serseri	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63. İddiasız	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64. Mücadeleci	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65. Merhametli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66. Ağır başlı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
67. Hoşsohbet	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
68. Değişik	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69. Neşeli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
70. Çok yönlü	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
71. Durgun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
72. Prensip sahibi	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
73. İddiacı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
74. Cömert	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
75. Duygulu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
76. Verimli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
77. Açık sözlü	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
78. Uzlaşıcı	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
79. Geleneksel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
80. Derin düşünen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
81. Başına buyruk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
82. Terbiyeli	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
83. Dışa dönük	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
84. Girişimci	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>		
	hiç önemli değil						çok önemli		
85.	Pratik		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
86.	Tutumlu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
87.	Sevecen		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
88.	Başkalarını düşünen		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
89.	Temkinli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
90.	Dakik		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
91.	Baskın		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
92.	Çekici		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
93.	Hüzünlü		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
94.	Disiplinli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
95.	Yetenekli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
96.	Kendi halinde		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
97.	İnanırcı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
98.	Programlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
99.	Cesur		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
100.	Aklı başında		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
101.	Aydın		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
102.	Lider ruhlu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
103.	Gayretli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
104.	İnsancıl		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
105.	İkna edici		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
106.	İlgileri geniş		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
107.	Düzenli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
108.	Anlayışlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
109.	Saygılı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
110.	Güzel konuşan		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
111.	Azimli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
112.	Vicdanlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
113.	Ağzı sıkı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
114.	Etkili		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>		
	hiç önemli değil						çok önemli		
115.	İşi sıkı tutan		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
116.	Vefakar		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
117.	Belirgin		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
118.	Hırslı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
119.	İyi huylu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
120.	Güvenilir		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
121.	Becerikli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
122.	İradeli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
123.	Uysal		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
124.	Amaçlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
125.	Zeki		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
126.	Mutlu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
127.	Şüpheci		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
128.	İstekli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
129.	Sadakatli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
130.	Karmaşık		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
131.	Kaygısız		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
132.	İşbirliğine yatkın		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
133.	Dinç		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
134.	Haddini bilen		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
135.	Gerçekçi		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
136.	Rekabetçi		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
137.	Duyarlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
138.	Saldırgan		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
139.	Emin		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
140.	Tutarlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
141.	Akıllı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
142.	Sakin		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
143.	Israrcı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>		
	hiç önemli değil						çok önemli		
144.	Araştırmacı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
145.	Sabırlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
146.	Rahat		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
147.	Sorgulayıcı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
148.	Alçak gönüllü		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
149.	Ölçülü		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
150.	Huzurlu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
151.	İsyankar		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
152.	Uyumlu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
153.	İyimser		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
154.	Dikbaşlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
155.	Muhafazakar		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
156.	İtaatli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
157.	Problemsiz		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
158.	Kararlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
159.	Kendine güvenen		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
160.	İlginç		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
161.	Espiritüel		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
162.	Asi		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
163.	İş bitirici		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
164.	Politik		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
165.	Mazbut		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
166.	Yumuşak başlı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
167.	Hatırşinas		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
168.	İleri görüşlü		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
169.	Kanaatkar		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
170.	İlgi çekici		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
171.	Pozitif		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
172.	Sert		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
173.	Coşkulu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>		
	hiç önemli değil						çok önemli		
174.	Çarpıcı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
175.	Özgür		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
176.	Sevgi dolu		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
177.	Özverili		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
178.	Kibar		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
179.	Zarif		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
180.	Edepli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
181.	Katılımcı		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
182.	Aktif		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
183.	Eğlenceli		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
184.	Sempatik		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
185.	Komik		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX K: YETİŞKİN ÖZSAYGI BOYUTLARI ENVANTERİ –  
HOŞNUTLUK ALTÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda kendinizle ilgili bir takım özellikler sıralanmıştır. Bu özelliklerinizden ne kadar **MEMNUN** olduğunuzu 0'dan 10'a kadar olan ölçekte gösteriniz

**0 = hiç memnun değilim .... 10 = çok memnunum**

1. Görünüş ve fiziksel çekicilik

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. Fiziksel kondisyon, güç ve çeviklik

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. Bakımlılık, giyim, genel görünüm

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. Beğenilmek, popüler olmak, başkalarıyla iyi geçinebilmek ve sosyal ilişkilerde başarılı olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. İyi bir insan olmak, arkadaş canlısı ve yardımsever olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. Sevgi dolu, yakın bir ilişki içinde olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. Yasalara uyan, sorumluluk sahibi bir vatandaş olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. Başkalarına karşı dürüst olmak, doğruyu söylemek

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. Doğru bildiğiniz şeyleri hoş karşılanmasa bile söyleme cesaretini göstermek

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. Ailenizle olan ilişkileriniz; aile bireylerinin birbirlerini sevip sayması ve karşılıklı iyi duygular beslemesi

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11. Aileye karşı sorumlulukları yerine getirmiş olmak; iyi anne-baba, iyi oğul veya kız olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

12. Zekanız; akıllı olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

13. Gördüğünüz eğitim süresi, akademik başarı düzeyi

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

14. Bilgili, kültürlü bir insan olmak; sanattan, müzikten ve dünya olaylarından haberdar olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15. Özel yetenek veya becerilere (sanat, bilim, spor, müzik vs. ile ilgili) sahip olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

16. Çok para kazanmak, değerli mal ve mülk sahibi olmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

17. Başarılarınız için takdir edilmek, çalışmalarınızla saygı görmek

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

18. Başladığınız işi bitirmek, belirlediğiniz kişisel hedeflere kavuşmak

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

19. Yaşamınızdaki olayları ve insanları etkileyebilmek

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

20. Üstün bir güce inanmak, manevi inançlarınız

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

## APPENDIX L: INSTRUCTIONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Questionnaire no:
-------------------

This study is being conducted for a master's thesis project. This questionnaire consists of several instruments. Please read the instructions on the top of each. There are no correct answers; it is very important that you respond honestly and completely. Be assured that your responses will be kept confidential. Please do not write your name on this form, to assure confidentiality. Thank you for your participation.

1. Gender

Female

Male

2. Age: \_\_\_\_\_

3. University: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Department: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX M: RELATIONAL, INDIVIDUAL, AND COLLECTIVE SELF-ASPECTS SCALE

Please evaluate each response item of the ten questions below, in terms of the degree to which each statement describes you. Please write a number from 1 to 7 in front of each statement using the scale below.

<b>Not like me</b>									<b>Like me</b>
<b>Not true of me</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		<b>Very true of me</b>

1- When faced with an important decision to make,

\_\_\_ a- I talk with my partner or best friend.

\_\_\_ b- I ask myself what I really want to do most.

\_\_\_ c- I talk to my family and relatives.

2- I think it is most important in life to

\_\_\_ a- work for causes to improve the well-being of my group.

\_\_\_ b- have personal integrity/be true to myself.

\_\_\_ c- have good personal relationships with people who are important to me.

3- I would teach my children

\_\_\_ a- to be loyal to the group to which they belong.

\_\_\_ b- to be caring to their friends and attentive to their needs.

\_\_\_ c- to know themselves and develop their own potential as a unique individual.

4- I regard myself as

\_\_\_ a- a good partner and friend.

\_\_\_ b- a good member of my group.

\_\_\_ c- someone with his or her own will, individual.

5- I am most concerned about

\_\_\_ a- my relationship with myself.

\_\_\_ b- my relationship with a specific person.

\_\_\_ c- my relationship with my group.

6- I would regard someone as a good employee for a company if

- a- he or she takes personal responsibility for the task assigned.
- b- he or she gets on well and works cooperatively with other colleagues.
- c- he or she works for the development of the organization or the work group.

7- I think honor can be attained by

- a- being true to people with whom I have personal relationships.
- b- being true to my groups such as my extended family, work group, religious and social groups.
- c- being true to myself.

8- The most satisfying activity for me is

- a- doing something for my group (e.g., my school, church, club, neighborhood, and community).
- b- doing something for someone who is important to me.
- c- doing something for myself.

9- I would feel proud if

- a- my close friend was praised in the newspaper for what he or she has done.
- b- a group to which I belong was praised in the newspaper for what they have done.
- c- I was praised in the newspaper for what I have done.

10- When I attend a musical concert

- a- I feel that enjoying music is a very personal experience.
- b- I feel enjoyment if my company (partner, friend, guest) also enjoys it.
- c- I feel good to be part of the group.

## APPENDIX N: INVENTORY OF ABSTRACT SELF-ENHANCEMENT

Below is a list of trait adjectives that can be used for describing a person. Please evaluate each item in terms of the degree to which it describes you **generally** relative to the other students in your university of the same gender as you, using the scale below. Please do not leave any item unanswered.

	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
I possess this attribute <b>much less than</b> others do	I possess this attribute <b>as much as</b> others do					I possess this attribute <b>much more than</b> others do	
1. Prudent	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
2. Cooperative	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
3. Attentive	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
4. Practical	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
5. Diligent	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
6. Courageous	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
7. Effective	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
8. Talkative	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
9. Plain	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
10. Cool-headed	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
11. Ebullient	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
12. Serene	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
13. Tidy	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
14. Self-sacrificing	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
15. Active	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
16. Principled	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
17. Good at repartee	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
18. Frank	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

APPENDIX O: CONTEXT PRIMING EXERCISE - *HOME*

Given below are descriptions of various situations. Please imagine yourself in these situations and answer briefly the following questions. There are no write answers for the questions. What matters is you respond honestly and completely.

Imagine yourself in your home, together with your family. If you are living with your family, imagine the times when you were with them. Try to visualize the rooms, the furniture, and everything you are familiar with.

What kinds of furniture are there in the living room? What is their color?

---



---

Imagine your father, mother, siblings, or other family members.

How many people constitute the household? Please specify the kinship place of each member in relation to yourself (e.g., my father's mother, my sister, my mother's mother).

---



---

Think about the things you usually do together in the evenings (for example dining, watching TV).

If you were spending an evening with your family, what would you do?

---



---

Try to invoke the sounds you hear, the things you talk about, your thoughts, as vividly as possible.

What do you usually converse about, when you are together with your family? Please describe briefly.

---



---



---

APPENDIX P: MANIPULATION CHECK - *HOME*

Please indicate below, the degree to which you visualized your family environment while answering the above questions:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I could not visualize my family environment at all					I visualized my family environment very vividly	

While answering the above questions did you feel like you were at home, with your family? Please indicate below:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I did not feel as if I were with my family at all					I felt very much as if I were with my family	

APPENDIX Q: INVENTORY OF CONTEXT-SPECIFIC SELF-ENHANCEMENT  
- HOME

Below is a list of trait adjectives that can be used for describing a person. Please evaluate each item in terms of the degree to which it describes you relative to the other students in your university of the same gender as you, using the scale below. While making this comparison, think of yourself not as you are in general, but as you are **at home, with your family**. Please do not leave any item unanswered.

	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
I possess this attribute <b>much less than</b> others do	I possess this attribute <b>as much as</b> others do					I possess this attribute <b>much more than</b> others do	
1. Prudent	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
2. Cooperative	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
3. Attentive	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
4. Practical	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
5. Diligent	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
6. Courageous	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
7. Effective	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
8. Talkative	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
9. Plain	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
10. Cool-headed	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
11. Ebullient	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
12. Serene	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
13. Tidy	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
14. Self-sacrificing	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
15. Active	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
16. Principled	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
17. Good at repartee	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
18. Frank	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

APPENDIX R: CONTEXT PRIMING EXERCISE - *SCHOOL*

Given below are descriptions of various situations. Please imagine yourself in these situations and answer briefly the following questions. There are no write answers for the questions. What matters is you respond honestly and completely.

Imagine yourself walking through the campus making your way to the building where you will take the class. Try to visualize the buildings, the trees, and everything you are familiar with.

Where do you imagine yourself? To which building are you about to enter? What kinds of things surround you?

---



---

Imagine you have encountered your friends with whom you usually spend time with, in the campus.

How many people constitute your friend group in the school? What is their gender? Please indicate briefly?

---



---

Think about the things you usually do before taking the classes (for example stopping by the canteen, eating or drinking, conversing with your friends).

Assume that you have time before the class, what would you do?

---



---

You are together with your school-friends. Try to invoke the sounds you hear, the things you talk about, your thoughts, as vividly as possible.

What do you usually converse about, when you are together with your school-friends? Please describe briefly.

---



---



---

APPENDIX S: MANIPULATION CHECK - *SCHOOL*

Please indicate below, the degree to which you visualized your school environment while answering the above questions:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I could not visualize my school environment at all						I visualized my school environment very vividly

While answering the above questions did you feel like you were at school, with your friends? Please indicate below:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I did not feel as if I were with my friends at all						I felt very much as if I were with my friends

APPENDIX T: INVENTORY OF CONTEXT-SPECIFIC SELF-ENHANCEMENT  
- *SCHOOL*

Below is a list of trait adjectives that can be used for describing a person. Please evaluate each item in terms of the degree to which it describes you relative to the other students in your university of the same gender as you, using the scale below. While making this comparison, think of yourself not as you are in general, but as you are **at school, with your friends**. Please do not leave any item unanswered.

	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
	I possess this attribute			I possess this attribute			I possess this attribute
	<b>much less than</b>			<b>as much as</b>			<b>much more than</b>
	others do			others do			others do
1. Prudent	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
2. Cooperative	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
3. Attentive	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
4. Practical	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
5. Diligent	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
6. Courageous	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
7. Effective	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
8. Talkative	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
9. Plain	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
10. Cool-headed	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
11. Ebullient	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
12. Serene	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
13. Tidy	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
14. Self-sacrificing	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
15. Active	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
16. Principled	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
17. Good at repartee	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
18. Frank	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

APPENDIX U: ADULT SOURCES OF SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY –  
*SATISFACTION SUBSCALE*

Below is list of attributes you may possess. Please indicate how **SATISFIED** you are with these attributes on the scale from 0 to 10.

	0 = not satisfied ....					10 = very satisfied					
1. Looks, physical attractiveness	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Physical condition, strength, agility	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Grooming, clothing, overall appearance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Being liked by others, your popularity, and ability to get along, your social skills	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. Being a good person, your friendliness and helpfulness to others	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. Having a close relationship with someone	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7. Being a law abiding, responsible citizen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. Being an honest and truthful person in your dealings with others	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9. Having the courage of your convictions, speaking up for what you think is right, even when it is not popular to do so	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10. Relationship with your family, being on good terms with your family, having good feelings to each other	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11. Meeting or having met your responsibilities to your family, i.e., being good parent, spouse, son or daughter	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12. Intelligence, how smart you are	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
13. Academic accomplishments, years of education	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

14. Being a cultured, knowledgeable person, knowing about art, music, world events  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15. Having special talents or abilities  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
16. Earning a great amount of money and acquiring valuable possessions  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
17. Recognition from others for your accomplishments and their respect for your work  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
18. Doing what you set out to do personally, meeting goals you set for yourself  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
19. Having influence over the events or people in your life  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
20. Belief in a higher power, spiritual convictions  
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10