

Collectivist Value Orientations among Four Ethnic Groups: Collectivism in the New Zealand Context

Astrid Podsiadlowski, *Victoria University of Wellington*
 Sephen Fox, *Victoria University of Wellington*

In this paper we present findings on individual level variation in individualism-collectivism (IC) among four ethnic groups (New Zealand European-NZE, Māori, Pacific Islanders-PI and Chinese) within the New Zealand context, using the Individualism-Collectivism Interpersonal Assessment Inventory (ICIAI) developed by Matsumoto, Preston, Brown and Kuppertsbusch (1997). The investigation tested the reliability of the ICIAI instrument with different ethnic groups in a unique national context as well as prevalent value orientations and behavioural implications for those ethnic groups, measured across three social contexts (family, friends and strangers). There were a total of 400 participants (36% NZE, 20.8% Māori, 18.5% Chinese and 14.3% PI). The scale has proven to be cross-culturally valid and reliable in the New Zealand context, contributing to the development of cross-culturally equivalent measures for individual variations. In accordance with our predictions, family proved to be the most important social context for all ethnic groups and NZE indicated the least collective preferences in all domains. Interestingly, Pacific Islanders showed the most collective preferences and distinguished the least between family, friends and strangers. The differences between NZE and Māori were smaller, and the similarities between Māori and Chinese were closer than expected. The findings, their interpretation and implications for inter-group relations add to the available body of international and intra-national multi-ethnic data on IC.

The study of culture has become increasingly important in the context of rising inter-cultural contact between and within countries. Huge populations have migrated from their places of origin, escaping wars or disasters or seeking employment or education. Trans-national trade and manufacturing have created a world-wide environment in which developed countries have substantial ethnic populations and large numbers of people are employed by foreign companies. The spread of Western culture has touched even the remotest corners through media, trade, and religious missions, including areas where these influences are at extreme odds with survival of indigenous culture (Allen & Chagnon, 2004). Many

of the difficulties facing humanity, whether in business or international terrorism, have been explained as effects of cultural differences and misunderstandings (e.g. Marsella & Yamada, 2000; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). Humanity now faces its greatest need for intercultural understanding. New Zealand has a particularly unique and compelling cultural landscape, with an indigenous population coexisting civilly if inequitably with the post-colonial European population for two centuries. In addition, numerous other ethnicities came to New Zealand, beginning gradually with Asian, South Asian, and Pasifika groups, with numbers and diversity of arrivals increasing dramatically in recent decades.

One of the most widely used frameworks for characterizing and examining cultural differences and similarities pertains to how individuals define themselves and their relationships with others (Brewer & Chen, 2007). Besides being widely criticised as a catchall to represent all forms of cultural differences and their frequent use as a post-hoc explanation of observed differences across cultures (e.g., Bond, 2002; Earley & Gibson, 1998), authors of recent reviews agree that the constructs of individualism and collectivism are important dimensions of cultural variation (Brewer & Chen, 2007; Oyserman, Coon & Kimmelmeier, 2002; Schimmack, Oishi & Diener, 2005). In this article we report findings on individual similarities and differences in values specific to interpersonal interactions among four ethnic groups (New Zealand European, Māori, Pacific Islanders and Chinese) within the New Zealand context using the Individualism-Collectivism Interpersonal Assessment Inventory (ICIAI) developed by Matsumoto, Preston, Brown and Kuppertsbusch (1997).

The Concept of Individualism-Collectivism

Culture has been described as a pattern of behaviours and beliefs that sets a group apart from others (e.g. Phinney, 1990; Keefe, 1992). Hofstede (1980, p. 21) described culture as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group from another.” For over a century, cultural patterns have been

proposed and described (cf. Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990). These constellations of attributes have often included variation of individualism and collectivism in communality of social processes, resource allocation, and motivations (e.g. Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Mead, 1967). In the individualistic model, the individual places importance on personal goals over those of a group (e.g. Wagner, 1995) and is archetypically perceived to be a separate and distinguishable entity, whereas in collectivist models, self and goals are construed to be an inseparable part of a family, a tribal group, or some other definably collective set (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Petrova, Cialdini, & Sills, 2007).

In his analysis of questionnaires completed by 117,000 IBM employees in 66 countries, Hofstede (1980) attempted empirically to define axes of differences between groups of corporate employees on a basis of national origin. Individualism-Collectivism (IC) was the strongest effect observed, and has since become a domain of frequent reference in the psychological study of culture (Triandis et al., 1990). Based on his country scores, cultures have been characterized as either placing higher value on individual autonomy and separation from others or on social embeddedness and interdependence. Hofstede (2001) noted numerous studies in which his country scores are found to be significant predictors of effects. Triandis (1995) suggests that there are many kinds of individualism and collectivism (see Triandis, 1995, for an extensive set of descriptive IC characteristics by which cultures have been differentiated, drawn from a number of disciplines).

Individualism-Collectivism as derived by Hofstede (1980) has since been criticized, elaborated, and extrapolated regarding its importance and validity as an aspect of cultural difference (Brewer & Chen, 2007). Critiques frequently include the potential fallacy of equating nation and culture (or diverse cultures within nations), the difficulties inevitable in quantifying culture, and the questionability of a universalist approach in cultural research (Baskerville, 2003; McSweeney, 2002). Another area of concern is that

Hofstede's national level data has been assumed also to have individual and group level implications (Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2006), which may more properly need to be treated as discrete domains. These issues shall be detailed further in the section below, and within the analyses presented, the intent of this study being their elucidation.

In psychological literature, emphasis has been increasingly placed on individual level perceptions and definitions of collectivism which vary in influence upon sense of self as an individual or a part of a collective unit (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Smith, Bond, & Kagitcibasi, 2006). Individual level phenomena include entitativity, or the level of being (e.g. individual or some type of group) at which goals are defined (Yamaguchi, 1994), or at which there is recognition of autonomy to make decisions and take actions (Kashima, Kashima, Chiu, Farsides, Gelfand, Hong et al, 2005). Research into individual-level phenomena requires further development of cross-culturally equivalent measures for individual differences which may then be linked to previously unexplained variation across cultural groups (Bond, 2002) and consequently help to understand potential sources of misunderstandings, but also support intercultural learning by making implicit knowledge explicit.

Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asia, and Lucca suggested in 1988 that, in addition to variation across cultural groups, IC valuations are likely to differ also by social context. Matsumoto et al., (1997) found that values such as harmony were important for in-group context, but were not extended to out-groups. Behaviour toward in- and out-groups has been observed to vary by ethnic culture and the type of closeness in a given context. Chinese children, for instance, expressed more positive assessment of lies told that hurt an individual but helped a collective than the opposite, and less favourable evaluations of truth told that helped an individual but hurt a collective than the opposite; Canadian children of European descent expressed opposite preferences (Fu, Xu, Cameron, Heyman, & Lee, 2007). Realo, Koido, Ceulemans and Allik (2002) found, however, that there are domains of collectiveness

(family, peers and, nation) that remained stable and persistent across samples from Estonia, Russia, and the United States. Despite the changes currently occurring in societies acculturating towards more individualistic values (e.g. Japan, China or India), there continues to be an intergenerational positive valuation regarding transmission of collectivist values when it comes to family. Indian and African university students in South Africa, for example, endorsed the importance of retaining core collectivist family values (Naidoo & Mahabeer, 2006). This continuity and persistence also applies to people leaving their country of origin, such as Turkish migrants who have moved to Germany, and Turkish and Moroccan migrants who moved to the Netherlands. In these cases, parental collectivism values were transmitted and the individualism of the host country was not transmitted (Phalet & Schönplflug, 2001). The importance of social context should have implications for intercultural interactions in different settings like working together, finding new friends at university or getting support when moving abroad.

In their meta-analysis of IC measures, Brewer and Chen (2007) found a conceptual confusion about the in-groups that constitute the target of collectivism. They posit that scale items variously measure relational or group collectivism, depending upon whether the groups described in items are more personalized with regard to connection and role relationships with significant others (relational collectivism) or are depersonalized relationships with others based on common membership in a symbolic group (group collectivism). They suggest that individuals achieve a balance between expression of social conformity and individuality that varies culturally in specific relational or more symbolic collective contexts. The construct of individualism and collectivism encompasses a wide range of psychological concepts (such as attitudes, values, self-representations) and social contexts (see Triandis, 1995). Research is needed to establish differences between types of collectivism (Schwartz, 1990) and to measure each unique dimension separately (Bond, 2002; Oyserman et al., 2002), clearly distinguishing between nation-level or

individual level analyses (Smith et al., 2006) as is done in the present study.

In addition to deficiencies in definition of level and context, the current body of research in IC is drawn from a very small number of national and cultural regions (Brewer & Chen, 2007). In their meta-analyses and review of the vast literature on individualism and collectivism Oyserman et al. (2002) show that the majority of available individual-level studies the participant populations come from Western, English-speaking (predominantly the US) and East Asian countries (Japan, Korea, PR China, and Hong Kong). Very few studies take the diverse ethnicities within a national sample into account (Smith et al., 2006). Research in additional nations and cultures in various parts of the world is crucial to understanding the full range of cultural differences across the various elements of individualism and collectivism acknowledging the multi-ethnicity of various nations as well as indigenous populations as in the unique case of New Zealand.

Measuring Individualism and Collectivism

Cultures have been described as shared sets of values, meanings, and behaviours (Phinney, 1990). Values are culturally inculcated and endorsed sets of preferences and endorsements for ways of thinking and being. Behaviours could be considered as actions actually manifested by the individual, influenced by the resulting palette of culturally acceptable potential choices (e.g. Hynie, Lalonde, & Lee, 2006; Smith & Bond, 1988). Though filial piety, for example, has frequently been cited as a value found in Asia but not in the West, it does not necessarily predict behaviour or psychological consequences in a Chinese context (e.g. Ho, 1996). If, alternatively, cultures are systems of shared meanings (such as beliefs or values) within a given social system (Triandis, 1972) then cultures are ideational systems. They are not, therefore, patterns of behaviours (Keesing, 1974), but are, rather, the means to define and evaluate behaviour (Rohner, 1984). Research has been increasingly directed toward unpacking these elements of culture (Smith et al., 2006) in measurement.

Along with Oyserman et al. (2002) and Brewer and Chen (2007) we refer to individualism and collectivism as one important dimension of variation, and concentrate on individualism and collectivism within a person (Leung, 1989), focusing on broader values and belief systems (Triandis, 1995) and their behavioural consequences. Measurement of IC may require distinction between particular groups and types of interdependence within those groups (e.g. immediate family, relatives, and friends) (Uleman, Rhee, Bardoliwalal, Semin & Toyama, 2000). We recognize that collectivism is not a stable target-independent orientation and have based our research on scales that have been developed for different types of in-groups (Hui, 1988; Rhee, Mull, Uleman & Gleason, 2002) to identify more specifically relevant areas of interactions.

Matsumoto et al. (1997) developed the Individualism-Collectivism Interpersonal Assessment Inventory (ICIAI) to measure variability of IC values and behaviours across social contexts. They identified twenty-five items from existing literature (Hui, 1988; Schwartz, 1990; Triandis, 1995) to measure “universal values such as love and security” (Matsumoto et al., 1997, p. 747). These were rated on a zero to six Likert scale for values (*not at all important to very important*) and behaviours (*never do it to do it all the time*), and repeated for social contexts of family, friends, colleagues, and strangers. Six studies were conducted to test the internal reliability of the items, the test-retest reliability and the validity of the ICIAI against other established measures, to compare the ICIAI to Triandis (1995)’s multi-method assessment and Hui’s (1988) INDCOL scale and to examine differences across four countries and ethnic groups within the US. The sixth study was conducted with university students in the United States, Japan, South Korea, and Russia. The Russian sample was equivalent to the South Korean sample in family values and behaviours, equivalent to the Japanese sample in stranger values and behaviours, and most collective in all other cases except friend behaviours, which showed no significant differences. An interesting result is that the Japanese

sample was least collective in family and friend values and family behaviours, supporting the need to include a wide range of national and ethnic groups to understand collectivist value orientations and behavioural preferences in relation to each other and not in absolute terms.

With the ICIAI we found a cross-culturally equivalent measure of collectivism (according to Oyserman et al’s, 2002, categorization) that captures values as unique elements of culture as well as unique dimension of individualism and collectivism (Hui, 1988) in relation to different social contexts. In assessing the importance of specific groups of people (family, friends, and strangers) also in relationship to behaviour toward them, we follow current recommendations to assess each hypothesized element of individualism-collectivism separately with a highly reliable scale. We use a direct assessment on an individual level to have information on which meanings of particular values are or are not shared.

The New Zealand Context

New Zealand has a unique history of intercultural contact. The Māori began settlement of New Zealand in about 1250 AD (Hogg, Higham, Lowe, Palmer, Reimer & Newnham, 2003). The first European encounters with the archipelago were led by Abel Tasman, a navigator for the Dutch East India Company, in 1642 (Slot, 1992), and by the English explorer and navigator James Cook in 1769 (Beaglehole, 1961). Unlike other British colonies, New Zealand began to be colonized by a series of treaties with the indigenous Māori population and involved relatively less use of military force than in other colonies. The first actual British settlement occurred in 1840, around the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2008). Disagreement over land rights and British excesses led to war from 1860 to 1872 (Dyson, 2005; Statistics New Zealand, 2006b). During the ensuing decades, the official system known as “biculturalism” developed, in which virtually all inhabitants were of Māori or British descent, legally bound to cooperation by treaty, though with

continued disparities and contested issues (Dyson, 2005; Walker, 1990). Among ongoing disparities, Māori have higher unemployment than New Zealanders of European origin (7.9% versus 2.8%, Department of Labour, 2007), a disproportionate presence in the penal system (Ministry of Justice, 2002), less income growth (The Treasury, 2007) and lower average educational qualifications (Statistics New Zealand, 2002). In comparison to 12% of the overall student sample only 6% of Māori students continue with a post-graduate education (Hui Tamata, 2005).

Problems of social inequalities and potential difficulties in interpersonal interactions may partially be based on misperceptions of different priorities with regard to value orientations and behavioural preferences. Using the workplace as an example for intercultural interactions, when asking New Zealand European (NZE) employers for specific critical incidents they encountered when managing a culturally diverse workforce they give examples of Māori employees extending the leave they were given for attending a family or tribe *hui* (gathering or meeting) without notifying them (Podsiadlowski, 2006). If the reasons behind are not understood, such critical incidents may just be the baseline for so-called “bad examples” that easily lead to over-generalizations and stereotyping and finally to less employment of people who are labelled as “unreliable”. If different priorities are acknowledged, communicated and integrated into daily workplace routines, mutual agreements can be made and solutions for critical situations negotiated, so that the workplace is representative of a society and may benefit from diversity.

Additional ethnic groups began to settle in New Zealand starting with the arrival of Indian and Chinese migrants in the mid-19th century (cf. Liu, McCreanor, McIntosh, & Teaiwa, 2005). Chinese migrants have now been part of the country’s cultural fabric for over a century despite strong discrimination through much of that time (Young, 1998; 2003). As a group, they have experienced a long history of acculturation living side by side with Māori and New Zealanders of European descent. Additionally, the Chinese

constitute the largest part of the so called new migrants who moved to New Zealand during the last 10 years, and of the international student population (Statistics NZ, 2000a; Statistics NZ, 2000b; Asia NZ, 2003).

Europeans from non-British countries also immigrated, primarily following WWII when skilled Europeans received government assistance for resettlement (Ip, 2003a). The Dutch, including Dutch Indonesians, became a significant percentage of the population, with over 20,000 present by 1971 (Phillips, 2007). A need for semi and unskilled labour in the 1970’s led to the first wave of so called ‘visible’ immigrants from the Pacific Islands (Loomis, 1990). In contrast to Chinese migrants, people from the Pacific Islands have only started to settle in New Zealand during the last thirty years, and they also experience strong inequalities in labour market and education participation rates and comparable unemployment rates than Māori (Department of Labour, 2007). Another group of frequent examples given by New Zealand employers refers to unexpected absenteeism and frequent turnover of employees from the Pacific Islands, which are often linked to family issues either in New Zealand or the country of origin (Podsiadlowski, 2006).

In 1986 and 1987, immigration laws were relaxed to facilitate importing of labour and skills. This resulted in a large influx of immigrants, primarily from the Pacific Island nations and various parts of Asia (Bartley, 2004; Liu et al., 2005; Macpherson, 2004; Trlin & Watts, 2004). Augmented by emigration of New Zealand born residents to other countries, a transition has occurred wherein nearly 20% of current residents were born elsewhere (Statistics New Zealand, 2006a), making the country a unique and dynamic locale in which to study acculturative processes and intercultural interactions.

The largest ethnic groups currently in New Zealand (4,027,947 total population in 2006 census) are NZE, primarily of British descent (2,609,592), Māori (565,329), Pacific Islander (PI) (265,974) and Chinese (147,594). 50% of the new migrants come from Asian countries, constituting 9.2%

of the current population, with India and China being the largest source countries (Statistics New Zealand, 2006b). Current issues and challenges for immigrants and ethnic minorities in New Zealand include unequal labour market participation rates for specific English speaking ethnic migrant groups from North East Asia, South Asia and the Pacific Islands. These have the highest unemployment rates, failing to reach parity in the labour market outcomes even after 10 years of residence (Department of Labour, 2007). Māori and Pacific Islanders are the least qualified groups (Department of Labour, 2007). Deeper insights into prevalent value orientations and behavioural preferences among the largest ethnic groups living in New Zealand may help to deconstruct prevailing stereotypes and illuminate issues of intercultural contact, e.g. with regard to communication, participation and settlement by making implicit cultural knowledge explicit.

Individualism and Collectivism in New Zealand

Previous studies (which are few) have observed general trends toward individualism in New Zealand (Fagenson-Eland, Ensher, & Warner, 2004; Hofstede, 2001; Kimmelmeier, Burnstein, Krumov, Genkova, Kanagawa, Hirshberg, Wiczorkowska & Noels, 2003), though without consideration of the ethnicities of participants. According to Oyserman et al.’s meta-analysis (2002), New Zealanders (not distinguishing between different ethnic groups) were both higher in individualism and lower in collectivism than people from other regions of the world. They were indistinguishable from other English-speaking countries like Australia, the USA or White South Africa (the first two having been the primary focus of attention).

Other studies have observed the indigenous Māori to be collective in orientation emphasizing the high importance of obligations towards, embeddedness in, and interconnectedness with the whanau (extended family) and the iwi (tribe) (Durie, 1995; Harrington & Liu, 2002). Given that the Māori and other Polynesian groups share common biological (Whyte, Marshall,

& Chambers, 2005) and historical (Rolett, 2002) origins, perhaps those cultures also retain deeply imbedded collectivist features (e.g. Mead, 2003).

Apart from Harrington and Liu's (2002) study on a bicultural view of the independent and interdependent self only Shulruf, Hattie and Dixon (2007) investigated individualistic and/or collectivist orientations of the various ethnic groups living within New Zealand and identified the Asian group as the most collectivist and noted close similarities between the Māori and Pacific participants. Altrocchi and Altrocchi (1995) found that the percentage of social content Cook Islanders use to describe themselves ranged from 20% to 57%, whereas New Zealanders used 17% social content. Due to the lack of information on collectivism for Chinese living in New Zealand, the following citations are drawn from results of studies in the countries from which specific ethnic groups have migrated. In Oyserman et al.'s (2002) meta-analysis, participants from the Peoples' Republic of China (PRC) were lower in individualism and higher in collectivism than the several other East Asian groups studied (Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Vietnam). Chinese (from PRC, Taiwan, Hong Kong) uniformly showed robust effects of being more collectivist than US Americans.

In reviewing of literature of individualism-collectivism including nation-level and individual-level studies, only two of those found included participants from any of the Pacific Islands (such as Cook Islands, Samoa, Tonga, Fiji). These participants are people who have migrated to New Zealand, certainly making them one of the most under-researched ethnic regions and groups.

In such culturally diverse societies as New Zealand, one needs to consider questions of mutual adaptation and accommodation with regard to the indigenous population as well as long-term and short-term acculturation of migrant groups. Unique combinations of historic interethnic encounters will influence the development of shared meaning and belief systems within and across cultural groups, as well as that of the concrete interaction among

members of the different ethnic groups involved. New Zealand has a unique history of an indigenous people who live comparatively peacefully with former colonizers of predominantly British origin, but who do not participate fully in all areas of life.

Objectives of the Study

This study attempted to replicate the results of a study that tested the IC axis across ethnicity, behaviours, values, and interpersonal contexts (Matsumoto et al., 1997) – in this case set in the geographical context of New Zealand and its relatively recent increases in cultural diversity (Liu et al., 2005). The objectives were therefore twofold: It was intended to test reliability of the ICIAI instrument with different ethnic groups in a different national context as well as to reveal prevalent value orientations and behavioural implications for the largest ethnic groups, thereby adding to the available body of international and intra-national multiethnic data on IC.

Among assumptions in development of the study, intended primarily to be a practical and instructional demonstration of IC for students, it was anticipated that the scale would be valid and reliable in the NZ context, that there would be differences between groups in preferences for more or less collective modalities of values and behaviours, and that there would be differences in all groups between expressed values and behavioural choices as observed by Matsumoto, et al (1997). It was also anticipated that all groups would indicate differences for collectiveness between family, friends, and strangers; and that values would not predict consistently behaviours. Further, it was anticipated that results would be consistent with data from other studies on IC when the ethnic group had been previously investigated.

Hypotheses

Based on Hofstede's (1980) country score for New Zealand tested among the dominant majority at that time and Oyserman et al's (2002) meta-analysis, the New Zealand European group is predicted to be the least collectivist among the four ethnic groups studied. Chinese as well as Māori are predicted to

be significantly more collectivist than the New Zealand Europeans. As communal relationships and relatedness are one of the core features of collectivism (Kim, Triandis, Kagitcibas, Choi & Yoon, 1994), we also predict the Pacific Islanders to be more collectivist than New Zealand Europeans because of the importance they place on the community and the extended families. Due to the lack of IC studies with Māori and Pacific Island participants, no predictions can be made about the ranking among the three ethnic groups that are predicted to be collectivist (Chinese, Māori, Pacific Islanders). Due, however, to their joint Polynesian heritage and the similarities in socioeconomic status and joint public discourse about these two ethnic groups in New Zealand, no significant differences between the Māori and Pacific Islands' participants with regard to collectivism are predicted.

Hypothesis 1a: New Zealand Europeans are the least collective group among the four ethnic groups with regard to value orientations and behavioural preferences.

Hypothesis 1b: There are no significant differences in collectivist value orientations and behavioural preferences between the Māori and Pacific Island participants.

Research by Naidoo and Mahabeer (2006) illustrates that values particularly with regard to families remain quite strong even in the presence of influences of modernization and migration on the values shared by a group of people within changing societies. We therefore predict that the highest importance is placed on the family for all four ethnic groups. All groups should also differ in their values and behaviours towards strangers due to greater ease of interaction with in-group members than with strangers (Guykunst, Yoon & Nishida, 1987).

Hypothesis 2a: Collectivist value orientations will be the highest towards the family and the lowest towards strangers for all ethnic groups.

Hypothesis 2b: Collectivist value orientations will be the lowest towards strangers for all ethnic groups.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Internal Reliabilities across all Ethnic Groups

Subscale	Mean	Standard deviation	Chronbach's alpha
Values			
Family	5.00	0.99	.93
Friends	4.53	0.91	.90
Strangers	3.13	1.05	.92
Behaviours			
Family	4.98	0.98	.93
Friends	4.56	0.90	.91
Strangers	3.14	1.03	.93

Note: N = 400

One major feature of Collectivism is the stronger distinction between in- and out-groups (Fu, et al., 2007; Gudykunst, Yoon & Nishida, 1987). Research, primarily with US Americans, has shown that individualists construe their obligation of others based on personal choice (Freeberg & Stein, 1996), show greater willingness to trust others (Yamagishi, 1988) and follow personal goals (Yamaguchi, 1994), thus increasing their facility in stranger interactions (Yamagishi, 1988) and reporting less disjuncture between the two situations (strangers versus in-group members, Gudykunst et al., 1987). Therefore the differentiation between the three different social contexts should be the least for the least collectivist group (the New Zealand European as hypothesized above) particularly with regard to behaviour. The more collectivist groups should differentiate more between the different social contexts.

Hypothesis 3: The more collectivist groups (Chinese, Māori and Pacific Islanders) will show larger differences in collectivist value orientations between family and strangers as well as friends and strangers than the New Zealand European group. These differences will be even larger for behaviour preferences.

Participants and Procedure

Participants were drawn from and recruited by students in the undergraduate Cross-Cultural Psychology classes at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, in 2005 and 2006 as part of their studies. Students were instructed to fill out a survey, and to have five other

surveys completed by friends or family members of Māori, NZE, Chinese, or Pacific Islander ethnicity with good English skills so that one sixth of the participants participated as a partial fulfilment of their class requirements. For brevity and practicality, the survey included only six of the original eight subscales relating to values and behaviours with regard to family, friends and strangers (omitting colleagues); each subscale used 18 of the original 25 items. The items of the subscales were rated on a one to seven Likert scale for values (*not at all important to very important*) and behaviours (*never do it to do it all the time*) respectively. Example items are: "It is important to me ..." (values) "... to follow advice for major decisions from my family" or "...to be loyal to my friends"; "I engage in the action..." (behaviours) "... to maintain status differences between me and strangers" or "... to avoid embarrassment for my friends." There were a total of 400 participants, of which 241 were female and 151 were male, with eight omitting response. NZ European were the largest group with 144 participants (36%). There were 83 Māori participants (20.8%), 74 Chinese (18.5%), 57 Pacific Islanders (14.3%), 36 other, and six omitting response. The mean age of participants was 25.9 (SD 9.67), with a minimum age of 12 years and a maximum age of 72 years.

RESULTS¹

Reliabilities. The study supports the reliability of the scale for the entire sample (Table 1) and for the different ethnic groups (Table 2). With Cronbach's alphas above 0.88 for all subscales the ICIAI proves to be very reliable

instrument to measure collectivist value orientations and behavioural preferences in different national contexts and for different ethnic groups.

Differences and similarities between ethnic groups. All ethnic groups expressed most strongly collective value and behaviour preferences for family confirming hypothesis 2a. For all groups, responses on each subscale for family and friends exceeded the midpoint of 4, indicating more collective preferences in these samples (Table 2). For nearly all subscales and all ethnic groups six out of potential seven Likert points (either one to six or two to seven) were used indicating the use of the whole range of the scale by the different ethnic groups. For the subscales regarding values towards family, behaviours towards family and behaviours towards friends the Pacific Island's participants only used four Likert points with a minimum of three and a maximum of seven. In line with hypothesis 2b all groups indicated a similar approach to strangers, with all responses falling below the midpoint of four and thus indicating more individualistic preferences in values and behaviours (Table 2). In all contexts, NZE indicated the least collective preferences and PI the most collective preferences (Table 2).

Differences between ethnic groups were tested separately for each social context and subscale, using a one-way ANOVA followed by Student-Newman-Keuls tests. The variance of the values and behaviours subscales between the ethnic groups was the highest for the family context with three subsets. New Zealand Europeans ranked the lowest, followed by Chinese and Māori, who did not differ significantly from each other, and Pacific Islanders (Table 2). Comparing the single ethnic groups with each other via two independent sample t-tests (Table 3), they show that the more collectivist groups (Māori, Chinese and Pacific Islanders) differ significantly from NZE in regard to family. The Chinese additionally differ

¹Data was analyzed using SPSS 14 for Windows. Means for each group were calculated on each subscale for comparison (Table 2), coded from one to seven (least to most collective). Data from Matsumoto, et al. (1997) was recoded to a one to seven scale for comparison purposes.

Table 2. Descriptives, Internal Reliability and One-way ANOVA for Ethnic Groups

Subscale	NZ European		Māori		Chinese		Pacific Islander		ANOVA F
	Mean (SD)	Alpha	Mean (SD)	Alpha	Mean (SD)	Alpha	Mean (SD)	Alpha	
Values family	4.53 (.94)	.91	5.14 (1.01)	.93	5.27 (.75)	.88	5.72 (.82)	.92	27.58**
Values friends	4.41 (.89)	.91	4.51 (1.01)	.92	4.63 (.82)	.89	4.78 (.85)	.88	2.6*
Values strangers	2.97 (.91)	.91	3.13 (1.16)	.94	3.32 (1.08)	.93	3.42 (1.14)	.93	3.2*
Behaviours family	4.55 (.90)	.91	5.08 (1.01)	.94	5.16 (.88)	.91	5.61 (.86)	.93	20.29**
Behaviours friends	4.41 (.86)	.90	4.58 (1.02)	.93	4.56 (.84)	.91	4.83 (.86)	.91	2.9*
Behaviours strangers	2.98 (.86)	.90	3.18 (1.15)	.94	3.24 (1.02)	.92	3.37 (1.25)	.95	2.4*

Note: N ranges from 392 to 394 with $n_{\text{Māori}} = 83$, $n_{\text{NZE}} = 143$ to 144, $n_{\text{Chinese}} = 74$ and $n_{\text{PI}} = 56-57$

* for $p \leq .05$, ** for $p \leq .01$

from NZE with regard to strangers and PI differ significantly from NZE in regard to all scales and social contexts. Hypothesis 1a is therefore confirmed with regard to NZE value orientations and behavioural preferences towards family for all ethnic groups as well as with regard to PI for all social contexts. PI also differ significantly from all other ethnic groups with regard to family. Interestingly, there were no significant differences between Chinese and Māori in any contexts. With PI differing significantly from Māori hypothesis 1b could not be confirmed.

Against our predictions, the strongest differences across contexts

were observed among New Zealand Europeans (one-way ANOVA) and the least for Māori. Hypothesis 3 could not be confirmed. This becomes particularly interesting when considering whether value orientations can predict behavioural preferences. Due to the young sample and some gender differences found for friends for NZE, Chinese and PI the regression analyses were controlled for age and gender. All equations proved to be highly significant but it is interesting in which context and for which groups behaviours were predicted best (Table 4). For NZE behaviour could be best predicted for family whereas for PI this accounts for strangers. The highest

predictions for Chinese and Māori account for friends. Looking at the value orientations across all social contexts behaviours can be predicted the best for Māori and the least for Chinese.

DISCUSSION

Our study on collectivism in New Zealand underscores the need for context specific measurement of collectivist values and behaviours and emphasizes the particular relevance of the family context when referring to the concept of IC. In this dataset, no difference of in- and out-group distinction could be found between less and more collectivist people with regard to friends and

Table 3. T-tests and Mean Differences between Ethnic Groups

Groups compared		Domain											
		Values Family		Values Friends		Values Strangers		Behaviours Family		Behaviours Friends		Behaviours Strangers	
		t	Mean Diff	t	Mean Diff	t	Mean Diff	t	Mean Diff	t	Mean Diff	t	Mean Diff
Maori	NZ European	4.56**	.61	.80	.10	1.16	-.16	4.06**	.53	1.30	.16	1.50	2.01
Maori	Chinese	-.92	-.13	-.82	-.12	-1.01	-.18	-.48	-.07	.15	.02	-.34	-.06
Maori	Pacific Islander	-3.58**	-.58	-1.61	-.27	-1.41	-.28	-3.17**	-.52	-1.50	-.25	-.93	-.19
Chinese	NZ European	-5.86**	-.74	-1.81	-.23	-2.47	-.35	-4.72**	-.60	-1.61	-.14	-1.98	-.26
Chinese	Pacific Islander	-3.27**	-.45	-.97	-.14	-.50	-.10	-2.9**	-.45	-1.79	-.27	-.65	-.13
Pacific Islander	NZ European	-8.28**	-1.19	-2.68**	-.37	-2.87**	-.44	-7.52**	-1.05	-3.06**	-.41	-2.53*	-.39

Note: N ranges from 392 to 394 with $n_{\text{Māori}} = 83$, $n_{\text{NZE}} = 143$ to 144, $n_{\text{Chinese}} = 74$ and $n_{\text{PI}} = 56-57$

* for $p \leq .05$, ** for $p \leq .01$

Table 4. Regression Analyses for Ethnic Groups

Values to Behaviours	NZ European		Māori		Chinese		Pacific Islander	
	R ²	Beta	R ²	Beta	R ²	Beta	R ²	Beta
Family	.71	.83**	.71	.83**	.48	.68**	.54	.73**
Friends	.62	.77**	.73	.86**	.64	.80**	.61	.80**
Strangers	.45	.66**	.72	.84**	.54	.74**	.76	.87**

Note: N ranges from 392 to 394 with $n_{\text{Māori}} = 83$, $n_{\text{NZE}} = 143$ to 144, $n_{\text{Chinese}} = 74$ and $n_{\text{PI}} = 56$ -57 controlled for age and gender

* for $p \leq .05$, ** for $p \leq .01$

strangers, implying that other factors need to be taken into account (age, personal situation or other relevant values, e.g. hospitability) to understand the specific value orientations towards and concepts of friends and strangers that might (or might not) differ between cultural groups. IC proves to be a useful framework for characterizing and examining cultural differences and similarities, but it is important to treat their implications with care as they refer to only one of the many relevant cultural dimensions, and they always need to be considered within a certain ecological and socio-political context.

One solution is to augment the available international and intra-national data by research of rarely studied cultural groups (with regard to specific national, ethnic and indigenous background) in light of inter-ethnic diversity, migration and acculturation, of which this study is an example. In this study, the ICIAI proves to be a reliable cross-cultural measure of collectivism in different national contexts and for different ethnic groups, and a useful tool to directly assess value orientations and behavioural preferences on an individual level. By measuring those types of individual variations directly, links can be made to previously unexplained variation across cultural groups, such as that found in workplace behaviour, attachment or communication styles. As the unique and somewhat unexpected results for this sample show, it is important not to draw conclusions from the available body of literature on IC which has primarily been conducted with US-American and East-Asian samples, but to look at the specific ethnic groups living in the country of interest and to include groups that have not been studied yet (e.g. Pacific Islanders, in itself a diverse group coming from different parts of the Polynesian archipelago).

Collectivism in Social Contexts

These results are in accord with Uleman et al. (2000), suggesting that a more differentiated view of individualism and collectivism is needed. Realo et al. (2002) talk of three clearly distinguishable types of collectivism: familism, companionship, and patriotism. The significant differences between the four ethnic groups studied with regard to their collectivist orientation towards family show a particularly need to look at the relations with family to understand potential cultural difference in value orientations and behavioural preferences. Despite societal changes towards individualism (e.g. Hong Kong – Stewart, Bond, Deeds & Chung, 1999; or India – Sinha, Sinha, Verma & Sinha, 2001) and migrant groups moving across national boundaries, there continues to be an intergenerational positive valuation regarding transmission of collectivist values when it comes to family.

While ethnic groups in this study differ significantly according to their collectivist value orientations and behavioural preferences towards their family they do not do so towards other in-groups (like friends) and out-groups (strangers). This accords with the observations of Li, Zhang, Bhatt, and Yum (2006) that Canadians were as interdependent as Chinese in self-closest-friend connectedness, somewhat contradicting basic assumptions of theories of independent-interdependent self-construal and individualism-collectivism. Li (2002) noted that, while Anglo-Canadians were more independent than Mainland Chinese in construing their relationship with family members and friends, strong cultural differences were found in self-family connectedness but not in self-friends

connectedness: Chinese were closer to their family members than Canadians, but Canadians were as close to their friends as Chinese.

When measuring IC it is necessary to distinguish between particular in-groups and types of interdependence with them (e.g., the immediate family, relatives and friends). Overall, family proves to be the most stable context when referring to potential cultural differences.

Consequences of Cultural Specifics for Intercultural Encounters

Broadly we can see links to studies with cultural groups of (Anglo-) European and Asian origin (the NZE being the least collective among the four ethnic groups, the Chinese being comparatively more collective). But to learn about values that may lead to unexpected or conflicting behaviour patterns in situations of intercultural contact between various cultural groups, one must examine details. In this study, it shows that Māori and Chinese do not differ significantly in any of the studied contexts, neither for values nor behaviours, that Māori and NZE were also more similar than expected and that Māori and Pacific Islanders were more different than predicted in terms of collectivism.

One factor in both the relatively collectivist results from the New Zealand Europeans and the differences between Māori and other Pacific Islander groups could be that two of the groups, Māori and New Zealand European, have coexisted and interacted for the better part of two centuries (e.g. Walker, 2004). There has been a long-lasting intercultural contact between Māori and NZE within the same geographic and national context, perhaps leading

to aspects of mutual acculturation and accommodation. For example, Hewson (2002) found that Māori and Pakeha samples were not statistically different from one another and Shulruf et al. (2007) state that Māori and Pakeha are quite similar in four IC domains (Responsibility, Unique, Compete, Advice) except Harmony and conclude "that it may be necessary to ascertain the degree to which ethnic groups (e.g., Māori or Pakeha) have commonalities in their acculturation to this ethnic group" (p. 398). Perhaps an awareness of such communalities can help in jointly working out the modes of how to preserve Māori culture as well as to resolve land rights disagreements.

One interesting difference found between the Māori and NZE subsamples refers to the link between values and behaviour. Behavioural preferences could be predicted best for the Māori participants for all of the three social contexts, which could imply some misleading expectations in daily interactions between cultures. It is possible that NZE and Māori place an equal importance on collectivism in the abstract, but when it comes to actual behaviour, decisions about how to act accordingly might differ, helping to understand why attending family gatherings is given a higher priority by Māori employees. It may be that employers understand and even share the importance social relationships play in New Zealand but that they do not expect their Māori employees to act differently in the workplace. Such obligations and commitment towards the whanau and iwi appear also to have an influence on where Māori students study and for how long (Durie, 1995). Questions like 'do I move back home if my grandmother is sick' or 'do I miss class when I have to help my sister out with babysitting' might be answered differently for NZE than for Māori students and have practical implications for their study and work behaviour.

In light of our findings of the high collectivist value orientations and behavioural preferences in absolute and relative terms for PI, the trigger for intercultural conflict in form of unexpected absenteeism and frequent turnover due to family reasons of employees from the Pacific Islands does

not appear so surprising. The results show, that care needs to be taken when assuming similar behaviour patterns for Pacific Islanders with the potentially more familiar cultural group, the Māori, due to their joint Polynesian heritage. People from the Pacific Islands need to be treated as unique cultural groups, also acknowledging the different parts of the Polynesian archipelago from which they come and the challenges they have to face when they settle in New Zealand for work or education. A limitation of this study is that participants' level of acculturation was not measured, a factor that could influence their degree of collectivism. Altrocchi and Altrocchi (1995) found that least-acculturated Cook Islanders used about 57% social content in describing themselves, whereas Cook Islanders born in New Zealand used 20%. Studying collectivist value orientations is only one aspect when learning more about a group's cultural value and belief systems. One of the striking results, for example, is the high importance Pacific Islanders place on stranger relationships, with the least distinction between the three social contexts measured. Though this could be also related to a methodological issue, the PI are also the group whose high collectivist behavioural preference towards strangers is predicted best by their value orientations among the four groups studied. It would be helpful to learn more about the value people in and from the Pacific Islands place upon hospitality or face-saving strategies. This would contribute to our knowledge of their cultural value and belief systems and their behavioural implications.

The public discourse and negative attitudes towards Chinese found by Ward and Masgoret (2006) and Ip (2003b) imply different cultural orientations between those two ethnic groups. Nevertheless, from a collectivist viewpoint taken in our study, Chinese and Māori do not significantly differ in their value orientations and behavioural preferences. Such awareness might help in intercultural encounters and reduce prevalent prejudices. Another particularly interesting finding that relates to the Chinese subsamples refers to the link between collectivist values and behaviours. Apart from the same tendencies for value orientations and

behavioural preferences in this study (which is certainly due to the quite parallel versions of those two scales), the Chinese behavioural preferences are the least predictable among the four groups. This is parallel to findings on filial piety, which is still regarded as an important value among Chinese participants of all ages, but is not necessarily reflected in actual behavior (Ho, 1996). It is often perceived as incompatible with modern life, hard to put into practice, and most disagreeable to the person, particularly for the younger generation (Lin, 2008; Liu, Ng, Weatherall, Long, 2000; Ho, 1996). Societal and generational changes are frequently used as an explanation for this type of discrepancy between values and actual behaviour, something which may particularly apply for the large and diverse group of Chinese living in various different national contexts (e.g. Miller & Rasco, 2004; Nguyen, Messe, & Stollack, 1999).

Those culturally specific findings have particular practical implications, e.g. in light of work and study behaviour and intercultural interactions. When assessing, for example, individual performance, interview behaviour, or communication style, special attention should be given to the differing importance people place on social relationships and how this may influence their commitment and behaviour towards various groups of people with whom they interact. Awareness of cultural differences (and also commonalities) and realistic expectations based upon explicit (as opposed to tacit) cultural knowledge may help to avoid disappointments and misunderstandings, e.g. creation of conditions or expectations which cannot be fulfilled. Conflicts may be resolved if reasons behind unexpected behaviour like absenteeism or low mobility can be understood. This becomes particularly relevant in multicultural teams or when managing culturally diverse workforces. Special attention should be given to people who are new to New Zealand and live outside their home country and the social support they might need, such as international students receiving support from their peer group.

Limitations

Of course this study is not without

its limitations. Measures were not included that would have shed light on the interpretation of the results, including social networks or time spent in New Zealand, and reasons for coming to New Zealand, perhaps leading to confounding effects of acculturation. Furthermore, we rely on only one measure of collectivism, specifically by using Matsumoto's et al. (1997)'s scale. Apart from its reliability and cross-cultural validity the subscales show very high inter-correlations, not distinguishing enough between values and behavioural preferences. Furthermore, we do not know the culture-specific meaning of terms such as family, friends or strangers that may influence their responses. Reasons for the lack in expected differentiation might lie in conceptualization of the term 'stranger'. In connection with this, we know that language used has an effect on the culturally specific meaning of concepts. In our case the questionnaire was in English, which could bias results toward individualist values, as languages choice shows an effect on collectivist values (Florsheim, 1997). Shulruf et al (2007; 2008) also state confounding effects of familism on the collectivism-individualism constructs and suggest defining two dimensions of collectivism: advice and harmony to avoid the need for measuring horizontal and vertical dimension of collectivism and individualism as Triandis and Gelfand (1998) suggest.

This sample is not necessarily representative of all strata of the New Zealand population (people connected to students of a cross-cultural psychology class), but such samples have been defended as being comparable across the ethnic groups included, in that the participants share similar educational and experiential features (Hofstede & Bond, 1984). Young age of the sample could skew results, but this did not have strong correlation with participants' self-construal in relationship to family members and friends in Li, Zhang, Bhatt and Yum's (2006) study.

There is a need to look into other dimensions of variability: "We do not know whether the dimensions of cultural variation that have been identified are the most important ones. We can show that one nation is more collectivist or

hierarchical than another, but there may be equally strong sources of variation within nations (Smith et al., 2006, p. 53)." Also, indigenous research could shed light on culture specifics, and on the relevance and consequences of different value orientations regarding individualism and collectivism within cultures.

Future Research

In this study we have demonstrated the importance of family and potential mutual acculturation and accommodation of indigenous and migrant populations in the long-term. For future research, there is a need to differentiate between different groups of people like migrants and sojourners and define relevant context variables on a group level (history of migration, national demographics, immigration policies, economic situation, social inequalities) as well as on an individual level (length of stay, motives to move abroad, personality, social support networks, copings strategies) to understand intercultural interactions within a culturally diverse national context and the role of different or similar shared cultural value and belief systems. Measuring collectivist value orientations on an individual level can help in understanding those relationships and specific difficulties different groups of people may encounter.

Clarifying the concept of individualism and collectivism, its elements and measurement will continue to be of future relevance. For example, in this study we could not show any difference in how strongly people distinguish between in- and out-groups with regard to strangers. Future research should not only distinguish between the different social contexts but also between degree of both individualism and collectivism. Having used a measure that clearly refers to collectivism (along the categorization by Brewer & Chen, 2007, and Oyserman et al., 2002) might have shown less differences towards strangers for the more individualist group (in our case the NZE participants). It may be that only specific measures of individualism can show the different distinctions between in- and out-groups. Triandis (2001) states that "we need to study the constructs, taking the domain

into account, and examining how acculturation results in different patterns of individualism and collectivism in each society" (p. 920). Treating individualism, collectivism, and context separately increases complexity in analysis and design of a study, but should yield more sensitive and accurate measurement of difference and commonality. This is in keeping with Brewer and Chen's (2007) distinction between relational and group collectivism, and allows analyses of these differing constructs. Individualist may not differentiate as much between friends and strangers as collectivist, but very clear distinction must be made in measurement, which would thereby allow cross-validation of the terms, definitions, and descriptions

The collectivist responses of NZE participants in all family and friend contexts complicate previous discussions of Western individuals as uniformly more individualistic. There are parallels to Oyserman et al. (2002)'s findings, that Americans were not less collectivist than Japanese or Koreans and that European Americans were not more individualistic than African Americans or Latinos. Paired with the greater similarities between Māori and NZE than the other Polynesian PI group, this could suggest an effect of mutual accommodation and acculturation. Such an effect may indicate future possible directions in acculturation as developed societies become more multicultural.

Certainly, this study shows that, at least in New Zealand, there is no justification for lumping together minority groups when studying differences in individual or collective orientation. There are a number of demographic factors that should be examined in future research, such as gender, generation, social network, and cultural distance. Future studies should differentiate between new migrants and later generation members on an individual level. The group level history of migration and subsequent experiences of different ethnic groups is also worthy of consideration as a factor in acculturation (e.g. Arab-Americans, Declan & Barry, 2005; Portuguese in Germany, Neto, Barros, & Schmitz, 2005).

Future research should look at how differences in collectivistic value

orientations can predict modes of acculturation for different ethnic groups as well as the potential for intercultural conflict, for example due to varying ease of interactions with strangers and communication styles (Kim, Hunter, Miyahara & Horvath, 1996; Kim, Shin & Cai, 1998). These differences have implications for a person's self-concept, well-being, attribution, and relationality (Oyserman et al., 2002), also affecting the successful integration of migrants and their well-being in their new home.

The findings are just a very small puzzle piece in understanding the complex relationships among ethnic groups within one national context, but cross-cultural comparisons within the same study can help to illuminate psychological variation between groups, particularly regarding groups where psychological (particularly quantitative) research is scarce (e.g. Māori and Pacific Islanders).

Acknowledgements

The data gathering took place while working at the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, as lecturer (first author) and post-graduate student (second author). We thank Mariko Cahn, Philippa Collie, Michelle Gezentsvey Lamy and Sammyh Khan as well as the students of the Cross-Cultural Psychology classes for their important help to gather the data. The first author received funding from the Commission of the European Communities as a Marie Curie International Reintegration Grant (FP/-PEOPLE-2007-4-3-IRG) under grant agreement Number PIRG02-GA-224818 for write-up.

REFERENCES

- Allen, W., & Chagnon, N. (2004). The tragedy of the commons revisited: The role of kinship and coresidence in the establishment and maintenance of corporate in-group boundaries in commons dilemmas. In Y. Lee, C. McCauley, F. Moghaddam, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The psychology of ethnic and cultural conflict: Psychological dimensions to war and peace* (pp. 23-47). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Altrocchi, J., & Altrocchi, L. (1995). Polyfaceted psychological acculturation in Cook Islanders. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26 (4), 426-440.
- Asia NZ (2003). Export education industry. Retrieved May 31, 2008 from: <http://www.asianz.org.nz/research/exporteducation#number>
- Bartley, A. (2004). Cotemporary Asian migration to New Zealand. In *Tangata, tangata : the changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*, P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, D. Pearson (Eds.) pp. 157-174. Southbank, Victoria: Thomson.
- Baskerville, R. F. (2003). Hofstede never studied culture. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 28(1), 1-14.
- Beaglehole, J. C. (1961). *The discovery of New Zealand*. London: Oxford University Press. (First published 1939).
- Bond, M. H. (2002). Reclaiming the individual form Hofstede's ecological analysis: A 20-year Odyssey. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 73-77.
- Brewer, M., & Chen, Y. (2007). Where (Who) Are Collectives in Collectivism? Toward Conceptual Clarification of Individualism and Collectivism. *Psychological Review*, 114(1), 133-151.
- Declan T., & Barry D. T. (2005). Measuring Acculturation Among Male Arab Immigrants in the United States: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Immigrant Health*, 7(3), 179-184.
- Department of Labour (2007). *Labour market reports*. <http://www.futureofwork.govt.nz/publications/lmr/lmr-HLFS.asp> (last update: May 17, 2007)
- Durie, M. H. (1995). Mental health patters for the New Zealand Māori. In I. al Issa (Ed.), *Handbook of culture and mental illness: An international perspective*. (pp. 331-345). Madison, CT: International University Press.
- Dyson, L. (2005). Reinventing the nation: British heritage and the bicultural settlement in New Zealand. In J. Littler, & R. Naidoo (Eds), *The politics of heritage : the legacies of "race"* (pp. 115-130). London ; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Earley, P. C., Gibson, C. B. (1998). Taking stock in our progress on individualism-collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community. *Journal of Management. Special Issue: Yearly review of Management*, 24(3), 1998, pp. 265-304.
- Fagenson-Eland, E., Ensher, E.A., & Warner, B.W. (2004). Organization development and change interventions: a seven nation comparison. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 40(4), 432-464.
- Fu, G., Xu, F., Cameron, C. A., Heyman, G., & Lee, K. (2007). Cross-cultural differences in children's choices, categorizations, and evaluations of truths and lies. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(2), 278-293.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Yoon, Y.-C., & Nishida, T. (1987). The influence of individualism-collectivism on perceptions of communication in ingroup and outgroup relationships. *Communication Monographs*, 54(3), pp. 295-306.
- 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), 33-55.
- Hewson, D. A. (2002). *Individualism and collectivism: A comparison of Māori and Pakeha self-concepts*. Unpublished master's thesis, Waikato University, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Ho, D. Y. F. (1996). Filial piety and its psychological consequences. In M. H. Bond, (Ed.). *The handbook of Chinese psychology*. (pp. 155-165). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Cultures*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. & M. H. Bond (1984). Hofstede's Culture Dimensions: An Independent Validation Using Rokeach's Value Survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 417-433.
- Hogg, A. G., Higham, T. F., Lowe, D. J., Palmer, J. G., Reimer, P. J., & Newnham, R. M. (2003). A wiggle-match date for Polynesian settlement of New Zealand. *Antiquity*, 77(295), 116-125.
- Hui T. (2005). Māori in Tertiary Education: A Picture of the Trends. Retrieved 8 May, 2008 from <http://www.huitaumatā.Māori.nz/pdf/tertiary.pdf>.
- Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 22(1) 17-36.
- Hynie, M., Lalonde, R. N., & Lee, N. (2006). Parent-child value transmission among Chinese immigrants to North America: The case of traditional mate preferences. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12(2), 230-244.
- Ip, M. (2003a). *Unfolding History, Evolving Identity: The Chinese in New Zealand*. Auckland, Auckland University Press.

- Ip, M. (2003b). Māori-Chinese encounters: indigene-immigrant interaction in New Zealand. *Asian Studies Review*, 27(2), 227–252.
- Kashima, Y., Kashima, E., Chiu, C.-Y., Farsides, T., Gelfland, M., Hong, Y.-Y., Kim, U., Strack, F., Werth, L. W. Yuki, & Yzerby, V. (2005). Culture, essentialism, and agency: Are individuals universally believed to be more real entities than groups? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 147–169.
- Keefe, S. E. (1992). Ethnic identity: The domain of perceptions of and attachment to ethnic groups and cultures. *Human Organization*, 51(1), 35–43.
- Keesing, R. M. (1974). Theories of Culture. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 3, 73–97.
- Kemmelmeyer, M., Burnstein, E., Krumov, K., Genkova, P., Kanagawa, C., Hirshberg, M. S., Erb, H.-P., Wiczorkowska, G., and Noels, K. A. (2003). Individualism, Collectivism, and Authoritarianism in Seven Societies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 304–322.
- Kim, M., Hunter, J. E., Miyahara, A., & Horvath, A. (1996). Individual and culture-level dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Effects on preferred conversational styles. *Communication Monographs*, 63, 28–49.
- Kim, M., Shin, H., & Cai, D. (1998). Cultural influences of the preferred forms of requesting and re-requesting. *Communication Monographs*, 65, 47–66.
- Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kâgıtçibasi, Ç., Choi, S.-C., Yoon, G. (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. Cross-cultural research and methodology series, Vol. 18. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kirkman, B.L., Lowe, K.B., & Gibson, C.B. 2006. A quarter century of *Culture's Consequences*: A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural value framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37: 285–320.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company.
- Leung, K. (1989). Cross-Cultural Differences: Individual-Level vs. Culture-Level Analysis. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24(1), pp. 703–719.
- Li, H. Z. (2002). Culture, self and self-clos-other(s)-connectedness in Canadian and Chinese samples. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 93–104.
- Li, H. Z.; Zhang, Z.; Bhatt, G.; Yum, Y-O, (2006). Rethinking Culture and Self-Construal: China as a Middle Land. *The Journal of Social Psychology*; 146, 5, 591–610.
- Lin, E-Y. (2008). Family and social influences on identity conflict in overseas Chinese. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 32, 130–141.
- Liu, J. H., McCreanor, T., McIntosh, T., & Teaiwa, T. (2005). Constructing New Zealand Identities. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations* (pp. 11–20). Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.
- Liu, J., Ng, S. H., Weatherall, A., & Loong, C. (2000). Filial piety, acculturation and intergenerational communication among New Zealand Chinese. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology. Special Issue: The social psychology of aging*, 22(3), 213–223.
- Loomis, T. (1990). *Pacific migrant labour, class, and racism in New Zealand: fresh off the boat*. Avebury: Brookfield, Vt.
- Macpherson, C. (2004). From Pacific Islanders to Pacific People and beyond. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata, tangata: the changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*, (pp. 135–156). Southbank, Victoria: Thomson.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253.
- Marsella, A. J., & Ring, E. (2003). Human migration and immigration. In L. Adler & U. Gielen (Eds.), *Migration: Immigrants and emigration in international perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Marsella, A. J., & Yamada, A. (2000). Culture and mental health. In I. Cuellar & F. Paniagua (Eds.), *Multicultural mental health* (pp. 22–44). London: Academic Press.
- Marsella, A., Bornemann, T., Ekblad, S., & Orley, J. (1994). *Amidst peril and pain*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Matsumoto, D., Weissmann, M. D., Preston, K., Brown, B. R., & Kuppertsbusch, C. (1997). Context specific measurement of individualism-collectivism on the individual level: The individualism-collectivism interpersonal assessment inventory. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 28(6), 743–767.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 55, 89–118.
- Mead, M. (1967). The life cycle and its variations: the division of roles. *Daedalus*, 96(3), pp. 871–875.
- Mead, M. (2003). *Cooperation and competition among primitive peoples*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. (originally published 1937, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.).
- Miller, K. & Rasco, L. (2004). *The mental health of refugees, ecological approaches to healing and adaptation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2008). Treaty of Waitangi. <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/category/tid/133> (retrieved Feb 24, 2009).
- Ministry of Justice. (2002). Ministry of Justice reports. <http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2002/> (retrieved May 24, 2007).
- Naidoo, J. C., & Mahabeer, M. (2006). Acculturation and Integration Patterns among Indian and African University Students in South Africa: Implications for Ethno-Gender Relations in the "Rainbow" Nation. *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 18(1), 115–132.
- Neto, F., Barros, J., & Schmitz, P. (2005). Acculturation Attitudes and Adaptation among Portuguese Immigrants in Germany: Integration or Separation. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 17, 19–32.
- Nguyen, H., Messe, L., & Stollack, G. (1999). Toward a more complex understanding of adjustment and acculturation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30 (1), 5–31.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H., & Kimmelmeyer, M. (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-Analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, (1), 3–72.
- Petrova, P. K., Cialdini, R. B., b, Stephen J., & Sills, S. J. (2007). Consistency-based compliance across cultures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 43, 104–111.
- Phalet, K., & Schönplflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of collectivism and achievement values in two acculturation contexts: The case of Turkish families in Germany and Turkish and Moroccan families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 186–201.
- Phillips, J. (2007). 'History of immigration', *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/NewZealanders/NewZealandPeoples/HistoryOfImmigration/en> (retrieved 22 March, 2007).

- Phinney, J.S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of the research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108 (3), 499-514.
- Podsiadlowski (2006). Cultural diversity at the New Zealand workplace. Paper presented at the XVIII Congress of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology, July 2006, Spetses, Greece.
- Rhee, E., Mull, E., Uleman, J., & Gleason, M. (2002). Cultural differences in relational collectivism and individualism. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Society for Personality and Social Psychology, February 2002, Savannah, GA.
- Realo, A., Koido, K., Ceulemans, E., & Allik, J. (2002). The components of individualism. *European Journal of Personality*, 16, 163-184.
- Rohner, R. P. (1984). Toward a conception of culture for cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15(2), 111-138.
- Rolett, B. V. (2002). Asian Perspectives. *Academic Research Library*, 41 (2), 182-194.
- Schimmack, U., Oishi, S., Diener, E. (2005). Individualism: A Valid and Important Dimension of Cultural Differences Between Nations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(1), 2005, 17-31.
- Schwartz, S. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21(2), 139-157.
- Sinha, J. B. P., Sinha T. N., Verma, J., & Sinha, R. B. N. (2001) Collectivism coexisting with individualism: An Indian case. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 4, 133-145.
- Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., Dixon, R. (2007). Development of a new measurement tool for individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 25 (4), 385-401.
- Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., Dixon, R. (2008). Factors affecting responses to Likert type questionnaires: introduction of the ImpExp, a new comprehensive model. *Social Psychological Education*, 11, 59-78.
- Slot, B. J. (1992). *Abel Tasman and the discovery of New Zealand*. Amsterdam: Otto Cramwinckel, 1992.
- Smith, P. & Bond, M. H. (1988). *Social psychology across cultures* (2nd edition). London: Prentice Hall.
- Smith, P., Bond, M.H. & Kagitçibasi, C. (2006). *Understanding social psychology across cultures. Living and working in a changing world*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Statistics New Zealand (2000a). Permanent and long-term migration. Retrieved May 31, 2008 from: <http://www2.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/pasfull/pasfull.nsf/7cf46ae26dcb6800cc256a62000a2248/4c2567ef00247c6acc256c790001b059?OpenDocument>
- Statistics New Zealand (2000b). Work permits and overseas students Retrieved May 31, 2008 from: <http://www2.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/pasfull/pasfull.nsf/7cf46ae26dcb6800cc256a62000a2248/4c2567ef00247c6acc256c790001b1b0?OpenDocument>.
- Statistics New Zealand (2002). Employment and income of Pacific peoples in New Zealand – article. Retrieved 9 May 2008 from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/products-and-services/Articles/Pac-ppl-emp-income-Dec02.htm>
- Statistics New Zealand (2006a). *History*. <http://www.stats.govt.nz/products-and-services/new-zealand-in-profile-2006/History.htm> (Retrieved 22 March, 2007).
- Statistics New Zealand (2006b). *Ethnic group (total responses) for the census usually resident population count, 2006*. <http://www.stats.govt.nz/census/2006-census-data/classification-counts/about-people/ethnic-group.htm> (retrieved 22 March, 2007).
- Statistics New Zealand (2008a). QuickStats National highlights. Retrieved 9 May 2008 from <http://www.northshorecity.govt.nz/PDFs/Population/Census-2006-national-highlights.pdf>
- Statistics New Zealand (2008). Census snapshot- Population & Dwellings. Retrieved 9 May 2008 from http://www3.stats.govt.nz/census_outputs/QuickStats_Snapshot_NZ.pdf.
- Stewart, S. M., M. H. Bond, et al. (1999). Intergenerational Patterns of Values and Autonomy Expectations in Cultures of Relatedness and Separateness. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 575-593.
- Tassie, S. & Whelan, T. (2007). Mainland Chinese students in Australia: The potential for stress related growth. *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies. Special Issue: Psychology of resilience and growth in Chinese societies*, 8(1), 71-89.
- The Treasury (2007). Income Growth and Earnings Variations in New Zealand, 1998—2004. Retrieved 9 May 2008 from: <http://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/research-policy/wp/2005/05-11/12.htm#fig1>
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J.G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Interscience.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism. New directions in social psychology*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality*, 69 (6), 907-924.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), pp. 1006-1020.
- Trlin, A., & Watts, N. (2004). Immigration policy and immigrant settlement: a flawed relationship at the turn of the millennium. *In Tangata, tangata: the changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*, P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, D. Pearson (Eds.) pp. 111-134. Southbank, Victoria: Thomson.
- Uleman, J. S., Rhee, E., Bardoliwalla, N., Semin, G., & Toyama, M. (2000). The relational self: Closeness to ingroups depends on who they are, culture, and the type of closeness. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(1), 1-17.
- Wagner, J. A. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 152-172.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Never ending struggle*. Auckland: Penguin books.
- Walker, R. (2004) *Ka whawhai tonu mātou (Struggle without end)*, rev. ed. Auckland, N.Z.: Penguin.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock* (2nd ed.). New York, NY, US: Routledge.
- Ward, C., & Masgoret, A.-M. (2006). An integrative model of attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 671-682.
- Whyte, A. L. H., Marshall, S. J., & Chambers, G. K. (2005). Human Evolution in Polynesia. *Human Biology*, 77(2), 157-177.
- Yamagishi, T. (1988). The provisioning of a sanctioning system in the United States and Japan. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 265-271.
- Yamaguchi, S. (1994). Collectivism among the Japanese: A perspective from the self. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications. Cross-cultural research and methodology series*, Vol. 18. (pp. 175-188). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Young, S. (1998). The Chinese in a Bicultural New Zealand. Retrieved May 31, 2008 from: <http://www.stevenyoung.co.nz/>

The-Chinese-in-New-Zealand/Other-articles/The-Chinese-in-a-Bicultural-New-Zealand.html

Young, S. (2003) Politics and culture: the background and recent developments in the political culture of Chinese New Zealanders. Retrieved May 31 2008 from: <http://www.stevenyoung.co.nz/The-Chinese-in-New-Zealand/Whats-New/Politics-and-culture.html>.

Corresponding Author:

Dr Astrid Podsiadlowski
Wirtschaftsuniversitaet Wien,
IVM
Althanstrasse 51
A - 1090
Wien
Austria
Astrid.Podsiadlowski@vuw.ac.nz