Implicit presuppositions and relational patterns in the Romanian educational area

Dana Gavreliuc, Alin Gavreliuc and Manuella Cîmpean
West University of Timisoara

This paper is dealing with social axioms topic in the educational area, examining the way in which different subscales of social axioms could be related with several personality dimensions, like self-determination, independence-interdependence, self-monitorization, and machiavellism. The research has been conducted on a sample composed by 524 participants (260 from universities and 264 from secondary school) in the Western part of Romania. Our study has underlined higher scores for social cynicism, religiosity and fate control, and moderate scores for reward for application. Social cynicism of teachers from universities is significant higher than the one of teachers from secondary schools. This outcome suggests acquiring of deceptive and disengagement patterns through secondary socialization in "school". At the same time, it could be observed a positive correlation between social cynicism and self-monitorization and social cynicism and Machiavellism, on the one hand, and a negative correlation between social cynicism and independence, on the other hand. The teachers at the university level prove to be more interdependent and machiavellic than the teachers from secondary schools. The results suggest a tendency to modulate the people from educational Romanian system in a dependent and duplicity manner, at the same time in the relational and in the institutional register.
.

Keywords: social axioms, personality dynamics, secondary socialization.

Address of correspondence: Alin Gavreliuc, West University of Timişoara, 4 Vasile Parvan Bvd. Room 242, 300223 Timişoara, Romania, e-mail: agavreliuc@socio.uvt.ro

The most consistent diagnosis of the Romanian educational area reveals that the "causal sources" for its failures (both systemic and personal) are found in the register of "mental inertia", characterized in rhetorical formula of disengagement as: "old mentality", "communist residues", "conservative society through excellence", "routines". Therefore, for example, the analysis report of Presidential Commission on Education talks about the residual nature of many behavioral patterns and conservative values of the educational environment, which are responsible for the character "ineffective, irrelevant, unfair and poor quality" of the Romanian education (Miclea *et al.*, 2007, p. 7). Our paper argues for highlighting the idea that the main obstacle to genuine reform of the Romanian educational area is not the lack of material resources or information available to Romanian "school", the poor opportunities to perform "accomplished biographies", the"bureaucratic" ineffectiveness; but, above all, the burden of "mental inertia" rooted historical, relating to a particular set of fundamental social attitudes implicitly assumed. However, when studying the "pathologies" of the system, either a psychological or a structural (strictly socio logical) analysis is made. Therefore, an approach which brings together the individual register (personal), structural (societal), organizational, but above all cultural, appears to be necessary and urgent.

In our analysis we examine the relevance of the premise that fuels an entire rhetorical of lamentations in the Romanian society about poor professional performance of the educational area, attributed to the modest resources, uneasy work climate and the "legacy" of heavy past more or less recently, and attempt to individualize the contribution of each register in achieving this "state of affairs".

Thematic explored through this project undertakes two major theoretical approaches:

- "mental inertia" ("mentalities") of the educational environment, which could be adequately investigated by a sum of increasingly influential theoretical studies of the last 4-5 years in the intercultural register, represented by *social axioms* proposed by Michael Harris Bond and Kwok Leung in their research coordinated between 2002 and 2008 (Bond, Leung et al, 2004a, 2004b, Bond, 2005, Chen *et al.*, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c; Leung, Bond, 2004; Singelis et al, 2003).

- "organizational culture" of the educational area can be examined starting from the consistent literature centered on the concept of "cultural dimension", theorized by Geert Hofstede (Hofstede, 1980/2003, 1986, 2002; Smith, Dugan, Trompenaars, 1996, Schwartz 1992, 1994, 1999, Schwartz *et al.*, 2000, 2001, 2005).

All of these trends will be operationalized, therefore, as follows: "mental inertia" through "social axioms" -

social axioms theory (Bond, Leung, 2002-2009) and "cultural dimensions" (Hofstede, 1983-2009); and "personal independence" through "self-determination", created in the area of self-determination theory (Ryan, Deci, 2000; Kashima, Foddy, Platow, 2002).

The central theoretical area of our approach is centered on the question of social axioms. Leung & Bond (2004) offer a definition to social axioms as general beliefs about oneself, social groups, social institutions, physical environment, or spiritual world, as well as beliefs about types of events and phenomena in the social world. This knowledge about the world may be construed as the personal representation that an individual develops over his or her life experiences about the distal social context constraining his or her actions in the world. Social axioms refer to context-free beliefs and assume the following form: A is related to B. A and B can be any constructs, and people's belief in a belief statement is reflected by their perceived likelihood of the relationship. For instance, for the belief 'competition leads to progress', some people may see a strong link between competition and progress, while others may think that the two are unrelated. In contrast, values refer to the importance or desirability that people attach to a construct, such as religion or power (Leung *et al.*, 2007). The label "axiom" is used to reflect the implicit nature that general beliefs have upon life, because a person assumes their validity without meticulous evaluation. The attribute "social" refers to the idea that these axioms are acquired through social experiences (Keung, Bond, 2002; Chen, Bond & Cheung, 2006). Like attitudes, social axioms serve four major functions; they facilitate the attainment of important goals (instrumental), help people protect their self-worth (ego-defensive), serve as a manifestation of one's values (value-expressive), and help people understand the world (knowledge). Social axioms are assumed to be pan-cultural because of their functionality and because of the universal problems that humans have to tackle for survival (Chen, Bond & Cheung, 2006).

To identify a cross-cultural structure of social axioms at individual level, K. Leung *et al.* (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of literature on beliefs, which is largely Euro-American in origins. Then, social axioms were identified by informants from different cultural groups on 4 continents. Beliefs generated from the studies were summarized in the primary list of social axioms with 182 items. Exploratory analysis suggested a solution with five factors, which presented a high degree of congruence in relation to all national samples. The factors highlighted in the study mentioned were: social cynicism, social complexity, reward for application, religiosity and fate control:

- *Social cynicism* reflects a negative view of human nature, mostly because it is being easily corrupted by power; a biased attitude against some groups of people; a mistrust of social institutions, and a disregard of ethical means to achieve an end (e.g. 'Kind-hearted people usually suffer losses').

-*Social complexity* suggests that there are no rigid rules, but rather multiple ways of achieving a given outcome and that apparent inconsistency in human behavior is common (e.g. 'One has to deal with matters according to the specific circumstances').

-*Reward for application* represents a general belief that effort, knowledge, careful planning and the investment of other resources will lead to positive results and help avoid negative outcomes (e.g. 'Hard working people will achieve more in the end').

-*Religiosity* indicates an assessment about the positive, personal and social consequences of religious practice, along with the belief in the existence of a supreme being. (e.g. 'Religious people are more likely to maintain moral standards').

-*Fate Control* indicates the degree to which important outcomes in life are believed to be fated and under the control of impersonal forces, but is predictable and alterable. (e.g. 'Fate determines one's successes and failures')

Hofstede's (1980/2003) dimensions of culture have become the most widely used model for explaining various effects across cultures. Stedham and Yamamura (2004, as cited in Ogden & Cheng, 2005) describe culture as stable and enduring but also somewhat changeable due to external forces. We are interested in this structural theoretical perspective because it is a correlative of Singelis's model of interdependence-independence, which is relevant at the interpersonal level (Rohner, 1984; Markus, Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995; Singelis *et al.*, 1999). Hofstede's five dimensions include five dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/ collectivism, masculinity/feminity and long term orientation. The dimension of individualism/collectivism has to do with the relationship the individual has with the group and more generally with society. Hofstede points out that the nature of this relationship determines not only how people think about themselves and their immediate group but the "structure and functioning of many institutions aside from the family" (Hofstede, 1980/2003, p210, *apud* Ogden & Cheng, 2005).

The dimension of individualism-collectivism refers to the relative priority given to personal goals as opposed to group goals. Individualist societies are those in which there is an emphasis on individual rights and where the goals of groups or collectives are subordinate to the goals of the individual. In collectivist societies, there is a greater emphasis placed on others than on the self, which leads to an emphasis on harmony and conformity and on subordination of one's own goals to the goals of the collective (Hofstede, 1980/2003; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990, *apud* Ogden & Cheng, 2005).

Self-monitoring theory is a contribution to the psychology of personality proposed by Mark Snyder in 1974. The theory refers to the process through which people regulate their own behavior in order to "look good" so that they will be perceived by others in a favorable manner. It distinguishes between high self-monitors, who monitor their behavior to fit different situations, and low self-monitors, who are more cross-situational and consistent (Snyder & Swann, 1976). Self-monitoring represents the tendency to monitor one's behavior and change one's behavior to the given situation. Self-monitoring is the trait of observing one's own behavior and adjusting that behavior when necessary to adapt to other people and surroundings. The ability to self-monitor is considered integral to effective social functioning. High self-monitors tend to adapt to situations, letting the requirements of the situation dictate their behavior. Low self-monitor behave relatively the same way in all circumstances and are less aware or less concerned about their own behavior (Rockwell, 2006). Snyder designed a questionnaire to assess self-monitoring called the Self-Monitoring Scale, based on the assumption that high self-

monitoring could be defined as consisting of: high concern with the social appropriateness of one's actions; use of social comparison information; ability to monitor one's behavior to fit different situations; ability to do this in specific situations; trait variability.

Machiavellianism describes a person's tendency to deceive and manipulate others for personal gain. Machiavellianism is the personality trait of manipulation (Christie & Geis, 1970 as cited in Rockwell, 2006). The High Mach is "a socially malevolent character with behavioral tendencies toward self-promotion, emotional coldness, duplicity, and aggressiveness." (Paulhus & Williams, 2002, p. 557 as cited in Rockwell, 2006). High Machs are controlling and use others to their own advantage. They tend to have "Type A" personalities and are less ethically-oriented than Low Machs. The Machiavellian individual has a cynical view of human behavior and a willingness to put that cynicism to practice.

In the 1960s, Richard Christie and Florence L. Geis developed a test for measuring a person's level of Machiavellianism. This eventually became the MACH-IV test, a twenty-statement personality survey that is now the standard self-assessment tool of Machiavellianism. People scoring above 60 out of 100 on the MACH-IV are considered *high Machs*; that is, they endorsed statements such as, "Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so," (No. 1) but not ones like, "Most people are basically good and kind" (No. 4). High Machs are controlling and use others to their own advantage. People scoring below 60 out of 100 on the MACH-IV are considered *low Machs*; they tend to believe, "There is no excuse for lying to someone else," (No. 7) and, "Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives" (No. 11). Christie, Geis, and Geis's graduate assistant David Berger went on to perform a series of studies that provided experimental verification for the notion of Machiavellianism. The most central component of the scale taps a respondent's feelings about whether other people can be manipulated so as to achieve the respondent's goals. Thus, the person high in Machiavellianism reflects a rather perverse type of trust; that is, a confidence that others can be influenced or changed by a combination of techniques employed by the manipulator.

Self-determination theory (SDT) is a general theory of human motivation and is concerned with the choices people make with their own free will and full sense of choice, without any external influence and interference. For example, a self-determined person chooses to behave in a manner that reflects his/her autonomy and his/her behavior is not to achieve an external reward or escape aversive stimuli in the environment. In simple terms, SDT focuses on the degree to which an individual's behavior is self-endorsed and self-determined (Sheldon, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 2002 *apud* Kalovelonis, 2007). The different types of motivation differ in the degree of self-determination, which is the feeling of the person that engages in an activity due to their choice, and they can be placed along with the self-determination continuum. On the left end of the continuum is the motivation, a non self-determined type of motivation and on the right end is the intrinsic motivation, the prototype self-determined motivation. The four types of external motivation fall along the self-determination continuum between amotivation and intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, as cited in Kalovelonis, 2007). According to the self-determination theory an environment influences students' motivation

through the satisfaction of their basic needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2004 *apud* Kalovelonis, 2007). Autonomy refers to being the perceived origin or source of one's own behavior. Competence refers to feeling effective in one's ongoing interaction with the social environment and experience opportunities to exercise and express one's capacities. Finally, relatedness refers to feeling connected to others, to caring by those others, to having a sense of belongiveness both with other individuals and with one's community (Ryan, 1995).

The aim of the study

The present project is based on exploratory research conducted in spring 2008 (March-April) in the Western Romania educational area, and suggests an extension (in terms of sampling) and deepening (in terms of factors involved in diagnosis) of the results obtained with the previous occasion.

The first dilemma that was the basis of the investigation can be formulated as: to which extend teachers belonging to pre-university or university area (which requires the completion of secondary socialization stages in quantitatively and qualitatively different educational environments) is accompanied by specific identity profiles in the register of 'common beliefs" and relational patterns?

At the end of this exploratory approach, resulted a series of identity profiles about "How are the teachers?" in the Banat (the region from the Western part of Romania) educational area aiming the register of "social axioms" and "relational patterns concerning self-monitoring" of the subjects.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 524 subjects (260 from universities and 264 from lower and higher secondary school) in the Western part of Romania (Fifth Region of Development – Timis, Arad, Caras-Severin and Hunedoara counties). Their distribution was homogeneous both from the point of view of specialization (they are teaching social sciences disciplines) and of propriety type of institution (all of them are from educational institutes belonging to state). Their age ranged between 25-38 years (M = 33.4). 30% of the sample was male (151 participants) and 70 %, female (373 participants).

Instruments

The Social Axioms Survey – SAS 60 (Leung, Bond, 2006). The SAS was developed by Leung *et al.* (2002) to assess general social beliefs. This study employed the 60 items version of the SAS consisting of five subscales - SA (Leung *et al.*, 2002). There are five factors in both versions (social cynicism, social complexity, reward for application, religiosity, and fate control). All responses were anchored on a 5-point scale, ranging from strongly disbelieve (1) to strongly believe (5).

Independence-interdependence (Singelis, 1994). Singelis (1994) developed and validated two scales to assess independent and interdependent self construal, called the self construal scale. Twelve items represent interdependent self construal, such as "Even when I

strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument". These argues relate to the extent to which individuals maintain harmony as well as value groups and relationships--and thus seems to entail both collective and relational facets. Twelve items represent independent self construal, including "I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects".

Self-monitorization (Snyder, Swann, 1974). The Self-monitorization Scale (SM) is a 25 items scale developed by Snyder and Swann in 1974. A score that is between 0-12 would indicate that the respondent is a relatively low self-monitor; a score between 13 and 25 would indicate that the respondent is a relatively high self-monitor. High self-monitors are particularly sensitive to other people and alter their responses to others' cues. They are more flexible and responsive to their environment than low self-monitors are. For example, high self-monitors can be expected to demonstrate greater flexibility in adapting their leadership style to changing situations, using a variety of conflict-resolution techniques. High self-monitors are people who readily adjust their own behavior to produce positive reactions in others and their actions are usually guided by the requirements of a given situation. They are different with different people and in different situations, compared to low self-monitors who seem less aware of or concerned with their impact on others. Low self-monitors' actions usually reflect their inner feelings and attitudes and they are less likely to change or adjust in each new context.

Machiavellianism – MACH IV (Christie, Geis 1970/ 1999). MACH-IV test was developed in the 1960s by R. Christie and F. Geis and measures the level of Machiavellianism. MACH-IV test is a twenty-statement personality survey that is now the standard self-assessment tool of Machiavellianism. People scoring above 60 out of 100 on the MACH-IV are considered *high Machs*. People scoring below 60 out of 100 on the MACH-IV are considered *low Machs*.

Self-determination Scale (Sheldon, Ryan, Reis, 1996). The Self-Determination Scale (SDS) was designed to assess individual differences in the extent to which people tend to function in a self-determined way. It is thus considered a relatively enduring aspect of people's personalities which reflects (1) being more aware of their feelings and their sense of self, and (2) feeling a sense of choice with respect to their behavior. The SDS is a short, 10-item scale, with two 5-item subscales. The first subscale is awareness of oneself, and the second is perceived choice in one's actions. The subscales can either be used separately or they can be combined into an overall SDS score.

Results

The main results could be consulted bellow (see table no. 1 and table no. 2). Research findings could be summarized as exploratory. Participants, regardless of their pre-university or university membership, are characterized by the following tendencies:

(1) in the register of social axioms:
- high *social cynicism* (one of the highest specific scores compared with the results obtained on the 40 national samples studied to date);
- moderate *social complexity* (lower than most of the studied national samples);
- *reward for application* relatively high (subjects have significant expectations relating to symbolic rewards for engaging in activity);
- high *religiosity* (only Islamic samples provide higher scores);
- high *fate control* (one of the highest scores of all the specific national samples).

(2) in the register of relational patterns concerning "personal autonomy":
- subjects preponderant manipulative (high scores on Scale MACH IV);
- strong self-monitoring personalities;
- predominantly interdependent;
- poor self-determinated (both in the emotional register, as well as in the cognitive one).

Table no. 1. Statistically significant differences between independent samples

Dimensions	Sample 1 Mean Secondary Education	Sample 2 Mean Higher Education	independent t samples results
SOCIAL AXIOMS			
CNS (social cynicism)	3.26	3.46	t(523) = 4.05. p<0.01
CXS (social complexity)	3.65	3.70	ns
RA (reward for application)	3.62	3.71	ns
R (religiosity)	3.40	3.53	ns
CD (fate control)	3.03	3.24	t(523)= 2.12. p<0.05
Machiavellianism Mach	61.46	70.93	t(523) = 5.23. p<0.01
Self-monitoring SM	15.12	18.47	t(523) = 4.88. p<0.01
Independence-Interdependence INT-IND	0.16	0.45	t(523) = 3.74. p <0.05
Self-determination SD	21.82	19.93	t(523) = 2.55. p <0.05
PC (perceived choice)	10.44	8.86	t(523) = 3.07. p <0.05
AS (awareness of self)	11.38	10.97	ns

ns for ps > .05

Table no. 2. Matrix of correlations among study variables

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. CNS (social cynicism)		-.34*	.11	.21	.42*	.41**	.29**	-.21*	-.51**
2. CXS (social complexity)			.35*	-.17	-.09	-.10	-.19	-.29*	-.44**
3. RA (reward for application)				.24	.20	.04	.11	.39*	-.09
4. R (religiosity)					.47**	.03	.12	.18	-.23
5. FC (fate control)						.10	.07	.21	-.56**
6. Machiavellianism Mach							.66**	.09	-.19
7. Self-monitoring SM								.13	-.24*
8. Independence - Interdependence									+.33*
9. Self-determination SD									

*p<0,05 / **p<0,01

Discussion

Concerning the register of social axioms, results indicate a high score on the scale of social cynicism. Cynical views seem to be prevalent in the modern world and many people distrust others and institutions around them, including politicians, business people and government. However, high social cynicism is expected if we refer to decades of communism where authority was excessively valorized, maintaining willingly, amongst people, a climax of fear and mistrust in others. It is clear for those who look back critically that "the authority" wanted a country of solitary people, where interpersonal interactions and solitary were feared, discouraged. As such, after decades of suspicious and duplicated interactions, we find that the ordinary subjects have forgotten to cooperate. Therefore, many of present behavior patterns have descended from: lack of responsibility and cooperation, mistrust in the institutions and their significant members, fatalism, deficient social hope, public disengagement – all those characteristics of the social cynicism – find their outcome in the contempt of the other. Into a cynic climax of valorous judgments, the alterity can be seen as "taking advantage of us", "using us", in who "we" cannot trust.

The cynic feels and then he thinks that "the dices have been thrown" beyond his power. Poor self-determining (both in the register of perceived choice and self consciousness) correlated with high cynicism indicate a pattern of vulnerability and helplessness. Social cynicism has been correlated with feelings of frustrations of self, disillusion and mistrust in others and ideology. These characteristics indicate the acquisition of an adaptive duplicitous identity pattern, resulting from the belief that other will exploit you if opportunity arises.

Moreover, the negative relation between social cynicism and independence indicates the fact that, the more cynic we are, the more interdependent, and thus, centered on interpersonal relationships and groups. Therefore, the cynic is engaged in manipulative, suspicious and deceptive interactions, where the significant other is closely monitored and can be exploited for personal gain. This statement could indicate a defective, vicious model of interpersonal relationship where social interactions are perceived as well-constructed "strategies" for personal gain. Results indicate a positive relation between social cynicism and machiavellianism, creating a more accurate image of the social actor with behavioral tendencies toward self-promotion, emotional coldness, duplicity and aggressiveness. Moreover, results show a positive relation between self-monitoring and social cynicism, on the one hand, and between self-monitoring and Machiavellianism, on the other hand. A cynical, more pragmatic view on self-monitoring would indicate the fact that people monitor their own behavior so that they can change those behaviors that are not interpersonally successful. This statement

would lead us to ideas of manipulation and duplicity. Although the suspicion associated with cynical views may protect people from being deceived (Leung & Bond, 2004), more often than not, studies have shown that cynicism can also reduce people's life satisfaction. As described in the studies of Leung and Bond (2006), social cynicism has survival value because it helps individuals avoid social traps and scams.

The second factor, labeled as social complexity, suggests a belief that there are multiple ways of achieving a given outcome and that a given person's behavior is inconsistent from situation to situation. A belief in the complexity of social life was associated with endorsement of both collaboration and compromise in resolving interpersonal interdependencies. The world-view that there are multiple solutions to social issues is a functional cognitive resource in contemporary social system. However, moderate scores on social complexity associated with higher scores on fate control and religiosity show poor familiarization with implicitly accepted behavior which indicates a feeling of diminished freedom of movement.

Thirdly, reward for application indicates unrealistic expectations concerning personal symbolic reward and shows a tendency of discontent towards the conditions of self reality. The state of dissatisfaction characterizes the individualism of the one who perceives himself differently from what he is in reality. Reward for application could be considered a coping strategy that requires grappling with the problem actively. Study results indicate an identity pattern of inadequate reporting to personal biographic success. As Leung and Bond (2004) observed, if a society constantly faces hardship associated with low living standards, social customs, structures, and institutions, subjects are likely to evolve into a configuration that is adaptive in a face of such hardship. Belief of its citizens in effort and hard work sustains the struggle against hardship, and beliefs associated with religiosity conduce towards social order and civility. Fatalism reflects some degree of helplessness in face of the hardship. Therefore, high scores of these social axioms seem interpretable as a consequence of the need to cope with difficult circumstances in living.

Religiosity was related to accommodation because of their mutual emphasis on sociality and agreeableness. Religiosity could be seen both as a general response to the spiritual need of humans and as a solution to many social problems. As Leung and Bond (2006) point out, religiosity seems to be more concerned with solutions to the challenges of creating social order and encouraging civility than with the satisfaction of spiritual need. Study results indicate a high score on religiosity (only Islamic samples have registered higher scores) and we can relate this to the feeling of subjugating to a higher divine force, hence the incapacity to take life in own hands.

Results on fate control indicate a tendency to accept any outcome without resisting. Fate control was related to

accommodation because of the passivity in the face of external forces involved in the endorsement of fate's power. The belief that events in one's life are predetermined by fate may incline people towards acceptance of what happens. Therefore, passive acceptance and the feeling that all is in vain, as the individual has no actual control over his own personal life, indicate a fatalistic life attitude. Fate control sharpens an identity pattern of implicit public disengagement. As results indicate a higher fate control in the university sample, the present study has revealed that, as one climbs higher on the scale of more prestigious institutions, with higher symbolic capital, is more inclined to asses that "the dices have been thrown".

Conclusions

When statistically significant differences occur between the lots of subjects of pre-university and university areas, they indicate an attitudinal pattern of disengagement, more duplicitous and manipulative as they "advance" toward a socialized environment involving (quantitatively and quality) "more education", which is both against intuition, but also different from the results obtained in other research which similar design (Kuo et al, 2006). In this respect, the university reveals itself to be a school of dependency and duplicity. The factor that anticipates best the identity pattern of disengagement is, of course, the cultural dimension of social cynicism, obstacle in the reform process. The implicit characteristic of social axioms, in general, and of social cynicism, in particular, as opposed to explicit, declared, attests its informality, the latency of its nature. Therefore, "mental inertia" is implied without complete consciousness of the individual, conferring to the social axioms an unrevealed, internalized character. Despite appearances that would indicate that the university represents prestige, transparency, competence, what this study reveals at the end is an identity pattern of vulnerability (low self-determined, high fate control) and the need to compensate for this deficiency by illusory, duplicitous strategies (high social cynicism, Machiavellianism and self-monitory). The deficit of symbolic resources implicitly assumed is balanced trough compensatory relational strategies that lack authenticity. Therefore, the emphasis is on what "they" seem to be, not on what "they" really are. Despite limitations of the study undertaken, particularly related to data collection by processes which did not allow sampling, the results suggest a trend of school in general and academics in particular, to shape those of the "system" in a more centered rather relational and institutional dependency and duplicity.

References

Bond, M. H. (2005). A Cultural-Psychological Model for Explaining Differences in Social Behavior: Positioning the Belief Construct. In R. M. Sorrentino, D. Cohen, J. M., Olson, M. P. Zanna (Eds). *Cultural and social behavior: The Ontario Symposium. (Vol 10, pp. 31-48).* Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Au, A., Tong, K. K., & Chemonges-Nielson, Z. (2004a). Combining Social Axioms with Values in Predicting Social Behaviors. *European Journal of Personality, 18*, 177-191.

Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Au, A., Tong, K. K., de Carrasquel, S. R., Murakami, F., et al. (2004b). Culture-Level Dimensions of Social Axioms and Their Correlates Across 41 Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*, 548-570.

Chen, S. X., Bond, M. H., & Cheung, F. M. (2006). Personality correlates of social axioms: Are beliefs nested within personality? *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*, 509-519.

Chen, S. X., Fok, H. k., Bond, M. H., & Motsumoto, D. (2006). Personality and beliefs about the world revisited: Expanding the nomological network of social axioms. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*, 201-211.

Cheung, M. W. L., Leung, K., Au, K. (2006). Evaluating Multilevel Models in Cross-Cultural Research: An Illustration with Social Axioms. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*, 522-541.

Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970/1999). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.

Hofstede, G. (1980/2003). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10* (3), 301-320.

Hofstede, G. (1991/1996). *Managementul structurilor multiculturale. Sofware-ul gîndirii.* Bucureşti Editura Economică.

Hofstede, G. (2002). The pitfalls of cross-national survey research: A reply to the article by Spector et al. on the psychometric properties of the Hofstede Values Survey Module 1994. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51* (1), 170–178

Kalovelonis, A. (2007) *Grade and Gender Differences in students' self-determination*, Georgian Electronic

Kashima, Y., Foddy, M., Platow, M. (2002). *Self and identity: Personal, social, and symbolic*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Keung, D. K. Y., & Bond, M. H. (2002). Dimensions of political attitudes and their relations with beliefs and values in Hong Kong. *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies, 3*, 133-154.

Kuo, B.C.H., Kwantes, C. T., Towson, S., & Nanson, K. M. (2006). Social Beliefs as Determinants of Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help among Ethnically Diverse University Students. *Canadian Journal of Counselling, 40*, 224-241.

Leung, K., Au, A., Huang, X., Kurman, J., Niit, T., Niit, K. K. (2007). Social axioms and values: a cross-cultural examination. *European Journal of Personality, 21*(2), 91-111.

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (2004). Social Axioms: A model for social beliefs in multi-cultural perspective. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 119-197.

Leung, K., Bond, M. H., Reimel de Carrasquel, S., Muñoz, C., Hernández, M., Murakami, F., Yamaguchi, S., Bierbrauer, G., & Singelis, T. M. (2002). Social axioms: The search for universal dimensions of general beliefs about how the world functions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*, 286-302.

Markus, H., Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Miclea, M. et al. (2007). *România educaţiei, România cercetării. Raportul Comisiei prezidenţiale pentru analiza şi elaborarea politicilor din domeniul educaţiei şi cercetării.* http://edu.presidency.ro/edu/cv/raport.pdf.

Ogden, H. and Cheng, S. (2005) *Age, Gender and Country Effects on Cultural Dimensions in Canada and China*, in Proceeding of 11th Cross-Cultural Research Conference, Puerto Rico, USA.

Rockwell, P. (2006) The Relationship Between Machiavellianism, Self-Monitoring, Emotional Expressivity and Sarcasm Production, in presenting at the annual convention in San Antonio.

Rohner, E. (1984) Toward a conception of culture for cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15,* 111-138.

Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*, 54-67.

Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the structure and content of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M.P. Zanna (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology.* Orlando, FL: Academic, 1-65.

Schwartz, S. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.C. Choi, G. Yoon (eds.), *Individualism and collectivism : Theory, method and applications.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 85-119.

Schwartz, S. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *48* (1), 23-47.

Schwartz, S., Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *vol. 32(3),* 143-161.

Schwartz, S., Bardi, A., Bianchi, A. (2000). Value adaptation to the imposition and collapse of Communist regimes in East-Central Europe. In Renshon , Dukitt (eds.). *Political Psychology*. New-York: Macmillan, 188-207.

Schwartz, S., Rubbel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89,* 1010-1028.

Sheldon, K. M. (1995). Creativity and self-determination in personality. *Creativity Research Journal, 8,* 61-72.

Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., & Reis, H. (1996). What makes for a good day? Competence and autonomy in the day and in the person. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 1270-1279.

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality, Social Psychology Bulletin, 20 (5),* 580-591.

Singelis, T. M., Hubbard, C., Her, P., & An, S. (2003). Convergent validation of the social axioms survey. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 269-282.

Singelis, T.M., Bond, M.H., Sharkey, W.F., Lai, C.S.Y. (1999). Unpackaging culture's influence on self-esteem and embarrassability: The role of self-construals. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30,* 315-341.

Smith, S., Dugan, S., F. Trompenaars (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *27*, 231-265.

Snyder, M.; Swann, W. (1976) When Action Reflect Attitudes: The Politics of Impression Management, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*(5), 1034-1042.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism – collectivism.* Boulder, CO: Westview.