**Introduction**

As an indigenous Māori of Āotearoa, New Zealand, I (the first author) have had experience in navigating the complexities of cultural values, practises, beliefs, and norms, in the development of cultural self-confidence (i.e., self-assurance of my own indigenous cultural identity) within a colonised society. Having faced the challenge of building a secure indigenous cultural identity as a minority in my ancestral nation, I write from a privileged position. Subjective as they may be, I draw from the many experiences that I have shared with whānau (family), friends, colleagues, teachers, and tutors. The concepts and ideas expressed in this paper are a synthesis of these many experiences and are therefore written from an indigenous perspective. My co-authors and I have used these indigenous experiences to generate a theoretical model, which combines various aspects of culture to explain the pathways to culturally-valued behaviour for indigenous minorities. We express these ideas with the expectation that they will be challenged and scrutinized by the same people with whom I have shared these experiences.

Writing from an indigenous perspective suggests that there is uniformity between geographically distant indigenous groups. However, the greatest similarities between most indigenous groups around the world are the consequences of colonisation and cultural oppression. Of the many devastating consequences of colonisation, including relative deprivation (Ward & Liu, 2012), poor health outcomes (Gracey & King, 2009; Stephens, Porter, Nettleton, & Willis, 2006), and disproportionate incarceration rates (McIntosh & Workman, 2017), arguably the most devastating issues are the threat to cultural identity and disconnection from cultural roots (Durie, 1998; Lawson-Te Aho & Liu, 2010).

For Māori, disconnection from culture and cultural identity was created through both overt and covert attempts to suppress, belittle, or extinguish Māori culture and cultural pride through colonisation. Reverend Māori Marsden described colonisation as a process of “cultural genocide” (p. 88) achieved through subjugation by war, law, or treaty (Marsden & Royal, 2003; see also Turia, 2000).

A treaty was signed in 1840 between a collection of Māori chiefs and the British Crown. However, the treaty was incorrectly translated, such that Māori were led to believe they were ceding Governance to the Crown, rather than Sovereignty. Even still, its promises went unfulfilled (Walker, 1990). Māori tribal lands were unlawfully removed or sold, causing Māori to move away from their traditional lands to urban areas in search of work or education, which led to the deterioration of tribal identity. Māori healing practises were outlawed by the New Zealand Parliament in 1907, causing the marginalisation of key cultural practises and cultivating an attitude of cultural inferiority (Mark, Chamberlain, & Boulton, 2017). The Māori language was banned in many schools, and Māori cultural perspectives were excluded from curricula (Durie, 1998). Forced assimilation fostered an attitude of indigenous inferiority, which was internalised by some Māori people (Dudgeon et al., 2016; Haenga-Collins & Gibbs, 2015; Webber, 2012). For many, Māori culture was pushed to the background, and cultural identity suffered as a result.

In concert with the suppression of Māori culture from the ‘outside’ came the minimisation of Māori culture from the ‘inside’ (i.e., by Māori). Some Māori decided to withhold the Māori language and cultural practises from their children (Ka’ai, 2017). Others lost exposure to their language and practises after moving to urban locales (Walker, 1990). Consequently, there are many Māori today who have not had the opportunity to learn the Māori language or its practises (Borell, 2005; King, Hodgetts, Rua, & Morgan, 2018). For instance, only one in five Māori can fluently speak their indigenous language (Statistics New Zealand, 2020).

Most Māori academics today believe that limited cultural learning opportunities should not preclude the development of a strong Maori identity. Instead, they propose that there are now many and varied ways to *be* Māori (Houkamau & Sibley, 2010). This position contrasts with a long-held belief that to be ‘culturally Māori’, one must have a high level of fluency in cultural practises (e.g., speaking the Māori language; Durie, 1995), and knowledge of cultural beliefs (e.g., ancient cosmological stories). These different perspectives regarding what constitutes being *more* Māori are complex and at times emotionally loaded. While Māori agree that cultural beliefs and practises are critically important, there is also a sympathetic position that one should not be considered *less* Māori if they have not had the opportunity to learn cultural beliefs and cultural practises.

A further complicating factor in defining Māori identity is the perceived congruence between traditional Māori cultural values and associated behaviours (Mead, 2016). Māori tend to scrutinize and evaluate each other’s behaviours, particularly those who purport to have fluency in cultural practises. In other words, Māori expect people to ‘walk the talk’ and behave consistently with cultural values in everyday contexts, not just ‘on the *marae[[1]](#footnote-1)*’.

In the present research, we use the term ‘culturally valued behaviours’ (CVBs), to denote *a subset of general, everyday behaviours that are consistent with cultural values.* It is a common notion that Māori who exhibit CVBs (e.g., caring for visitors) are more ‘authentic’, while those whose behaviours are in opposition to cultural values (e.g., treating other people with disrespect) are often considered *less Māori*.

One of the key purposes of this article is to consider the differing perspectives regarding what constitutes cultural identity for indigenous minorities. In our view, knowledge of beliefs, adherence to cultural norms, fluency in cultural practises, the enaction of cultural values, andone’s cultural self-perception *all* have a role in indigenous cultural identity. We are not aware of any theory of cultural identity that integrates all of these aspects into a single model, and the essential point of the present paper is that it would be valuable to do so. Indeed, we will present a theoretical model which accounts for cultural values, beliefs, practises, norms, and behaviours.

Culture is a notoriously difficult concept to adequately define (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Kukutai, 2004); however, from the perspective of cultural psychology, culture may be viewed as a somewhat vague, generic construct, characterised by dynamic processes rather than static conditions, that captures the complexity of human lives (Valsiner, 2018). More specifically, Valsiner (2003, p. 4) argues that “culture becomes exemplified through different processes by which persons interact with their worlds.” Ultimately, culture is about shared meanings and ways of understanding and interpreting the world (D’Andrade, 1984). Not only are these communal understandings grounded in a shared ecological and social context and a collective history, but they also underpin and give meaning to cultural values, beliefs, and practises that are transmitted across generations (Shweder, 1991; Shweder & Beldo, 2015). These three expressions of culture — values, beliefs and practises — interact with each other in meaningful ways, which we will explore in this paper.

In this article we bring these cultural expressions together under the umbrella term ‘cultural embeddedness.’ As indigenous research consistently supports the hypothesis that connecting to cultural beliefs, values, and practises (i.e., improving cultural embeddedness) enhances wellbeing for indigenous minorities (Fox, Neha, & Jose, 2018; Muriwai, Houkamau, & Sibley, 2015; Stuart & Jose, 2014), understanding the dynamic interactions among these expressions of culture may lead to improving psychological and social outcomes for indigenous peoples.

**Defining Cultural Embeddedness**

We have utilized the term cultural embeddedness in previous research with Māori people, defining *Māori* cultural embeddedness as: “the foundation of Māori cultural identity, achieved through engagement with the core features of Māori culture…” (Fox, Neha, & Jose, 2018, p. 14). In the present research, we extend our previous definition of cultural embeddedness to enumerate some of its key features. Our revised and more nuanced definition of cultural embeddedness is: “*the degree to which individuals have utilised opportunities to learn, experience, engage with, and integrate the core beliefs, values, and practises of their culture.*”

This definition is sensitive to the varying levels of cultural learning through available opportunities, which is important because many colonised minorities have been deprived of such opportunities. We thus assume that those people who are culturally embedded have utilised cultural opportunities; however, those individuals with lower levels of embeddedness have either had limited opportunities or have not utilised the opportunities that were available to them (or both). Our definition of embeddedness also differentiates between knowledge, experience, engagement, and integration of values, beliefs, and practises. This view acknowledges that there are various ways in which one can become embedded in their heritage culture, including theoretical learning, exposure to cultural spaces, and engagement in cultural activities, relative to the cultural learning opportunities presented.

Finally, our definition of cultural embeddedness relates to the processes by which individuals acquire culturally shared meanings and articulate these understandings through cultural values, cultural practises, and cultural beliefs. Our cultural embeddedness model accepts that members of an indigenous minority can be at different stages or levels of understanding and familiarity with these aspects of their culture and therefore express their cultural identities in different ways. For instance, an indigenous individual may have a deep understanding of cultural practises, but a limited understanding of cultural values, and therefore express cultural identity in more formal and ritualistic ways based on their understanding of formal rituals and practises. On the other hand, another indigenous individual may express his cultural identity in more natural ways, without necessarily being familiar with the formality of cultural practices.

**Cultural Embeddedness, Acculturation and Enculturation of Indigenous Peoples**

The process and outcomes of cultural embeddedness for indigenous peoples must be interpreted not only in their historical and socio-political context, but also in relation to the experiences of enculturation and acculturation. Enculturation is generally understood as the process by which individuals acquire the identity, behaviours, language, norms and values of a specific group, typically an ethnic or cultural group (Hakim-Lawson & Menna, 2016; Yoon et al., 2013). Acculturation, by contrast, refers to changes arising from sustained intercultural contract. These changes may occur at the macro-level (e.g., changes in cultures, groups and communities) or at the micro-level (e.g., changes in individuals). To distinguish the two levels, changes at the individual level are often referred to as psychological acculturation (Berry & Sam, 2016).

These distinctions are important because the colonisation of indigenous peoples has impacted both indigenous cultures and individuals. In Āotearoa New Zealand, like other settler societies, there have been vigorous and sustained attempts at assimilation (Ward & Mak, 2016), to the extent that some indigenous scholars have referred to this as cultural genocide (Dudgeon et al., 2016; Kirmayer, Gone & Moses, 2014). While both Māori culture and the dominant colonial culture have effected acculturative changes in the opposite group over time and continue to influence each other today, the historical and current power imbalances have precluded symmetrical or equal influences. This brings into question the context and boundaries of enculturation for Māori. The reality is that most Māori are enculturated both as New Zealanders with the pervading language, behaviours, norms, and values shaped primarily by the dominant post-colonial culture, and as *tangata whenua* (people of the land, indigenous peoples) with their traditional cultural expressions. The extent to which Māori have access to their indigenous cultural roots is often limited and highly variable- so much so that Huriwai (2002) refers to the “re-enculturation” of Māori.

Huriwai (2002, p. 1261) argues that Māori must function simultaneously within “a number of social and cultural realities,” noting that not all Māori have been raised in a customary context and that the understanding and relevance of traditional Māori values vary considerably across individuals. This elaboration of Māori experiences supports our conceptualisation of cultural embeddedness and its emphasis on having and using opportunities to engage with multiple facets of traditional culture, its beliefs, values and practises. Moreover, indigenous theoretical frameworks for conceptualising Māori cultural identity, such as Te Hoe Nuku Roa (Durie, 1995), emphasise not only the importance of knowledge and understanding of Māori culture, but also access to and participation in Māori institutions, such as marae. Accordingly, the reality of cultural embeddedness for Māori, as well as other indigenous peoples, is not simply a question of enculturation or acculturation, but is dependent upon maximizing opportunities to immerse oneself in indigenous culture.

**The Triad of Embeddedness: Cultural Values, Practises, and Beliefs**

It is our proposition that the dynamic process of becoming embedded in indigenous cultures begins with cultural learning opportunities, achieved through exposure to at least one of the three critical expressions of culture – its values, beliefs, and/or practises – which together constitute what we call *the triad of embeddedness*. In our conceptualisation of cultural embeddedness, we stipulate that familiarity and fluency in each of these aspects of culture is equally important and jointly necessary. In other words, it is just as important to be embedded within cultural values as it is to be embedded in cultural practises. However, we also propose that these domains of cultural expression can be exercised independently such that, for instance, embeddedness in cultural values can occur without a thorough understanding of cultural beliefs and so forth.

In the cultural embeddedness model, cultural self-awareness is a key consideration, particularly when contrasting cultural values with cultural practises. Cultural values often exert their influence on behaviour through implicit means (e.g., S.H. Schwartz, 2012), while cultural practises are intentional, public, conscious, and salient. Cultural practises are usually intended to express cultural values (Mead, 2016); however, performing cultural practises do not always ensure that cultural values are upheld. For example, the Māori practise of *pōwhiri* is a way of formally settling visitors into the host’s space, which is underpinned by the value of *manaakitanga* (uplifting the inherent value of others). However, if the *pōwhiri* is delivered in an unwelcoming or degrading manner (which can sometimes happen), then the value of *manaakitanga* has not been upheld, despite the overt welcoming practise occurring.

Often indigenous minorities have limited awareness of the process through which cultural values motivate behaviours, and this dynamic is of particular interest in the cultural embeddedness model. Because cultural practises are publicly enacted cultural behaviours and, in contrast, cultural values exert their influence below awareness, it would be natural to suppose that practises are more important than values. However, our model of cultural embeddedness challenges this supposition by considering those people who are fluent in cultural practises (e.g., speaking the indigenous language), but who act in opposition to cultural values (e.g., treating other people with disrespect), as equally embedded as those persons who are immersed in cultural values but are yet to gain experience in cultural practises. Cultural embeddedness thus accounts for various patterns of *being* embedded, with varying degrees of cultural insights, awareness, and intentionality (Balanovic, Stuart, & Ward, 2020), which have been largely overlooked or discounted in the wider literature.

We will now expand on each component of cultural embeddedness: Beliefs, values, and practises. We will also outline, in greater detail, the concept of culturally valued behaviours (CVBs).

**Cultural Beliefs**

Culture is expressed in shared beliefs, which include worldviews (Koltko-Rivera, 2004), cultural narratives, and tribal lore (e.g., Orbell, 1995). These belief systems provide a shared perspective through which members of a cultural group observe and understand the world. Individuals who are embedded in cultural beliefs will be able to utilise their cultural perspective to make sense of the world in similar ways to other members of their cultural group (Koltko-Rivera, 2004).

Cultural belief systems include both a) existential beliefs, relating to such things as the origin of life, the existence of spirit, and the role of humans in the universe, and b) evaluative beliefs, which categorically determine what things are good, bad, or restricted by custom (i.e., taboo/*tapu*). They also support the foundational principles through which cultural values are understood and upon which cultural practises are built. For instance, Māori cultural beliefs are transmitted through *whakapapa* narratives, which are didactic accounts of cosmological beliefs woven into tribal history and genealogy.

*Whakapapa* narratives often contain lessons regarding the importance of particular values and the origin of traditional practises. As an example, one widely held Māori cultural existential belief is that Tāne, a demigod, created the first human out of clay, then breathed life into her. This is believed to be the origin of the *hongi* practise, whereby two individuals press noses and share a unified breath. The example above demonstrates how traditional beliefs (the *whakapapa* narrative) can bring meaning to practises (e.g., *hongi*) and understanding to values (i.e., the value of human life which Māori consider ‘the most important thing in the world’; Masters-Awatere, Rarere, Gilbert, Manuel, & Scott, 2019). In this way, beliefs, values and practises can be seen as constituting a dynamic, integrated, cultural system.

**Cultural Values**

S.H. Schwartz (2012) defines values as criteria or goals that serve as guiding principles towards higher-order life goals. Cultural values, then, are standards of expectation that are shared by the cultural group and serve as guiding life principles. These values provide the cultural group with a unified moral understanding, which motivate engagement in moral(i.e., culturally valued) behaviours (Dihn et al., 2012). Māori, for instance, place high importance on the value of *Manaakitanga*,which means to acknowledge and uplift the inherent value of people (Mead, 2016). Therefore, in all situations, behaviours, and interactions, Māori are expected to ensure that the inherent value of the person or people is not diminished, disrespected, or disregarded. It is important to note, however, that values are idealistic (S.H. Schwartz, 2012), and it is not always possible to live by them all of the time in all situations.

Although there is a strong relationship between implicit values and automatic decision-making on an everyday basis, values can also exert explicit influences on conscious, deliberate decision-making (Dinh et al., 2012). When individuals integrate cultural values into their identities (i.e., become embedded in cultural values), those values become strongly motivating and activate both implicit and explicit drivers of behaviour. Values set high standards; however, individuals can rise to the challenge when those values are integrated into their cultural identity and sense of self.

Shared cultural values are relatively resilient under conditions of intercultural contact, most likely because those values can be internalised and integrated into an individual’s personal identity. Indeed, research has shown that cultural practises can be modified relatively quickly during intercultural contact, whereas values are more resistant to change (S.J. Schwartz et al., 2015). In the context of colonisation, the resilience of cultural values can play a pivotal role in maintaining cultural heritage during intercultural contact. Internalised cultural values can be transmitted intergenerationally, without necessarily relying on explicit knowledge of cultural beliefs or experience in cultural practices.

Cultural values are dependent on historical, ecological and socio-political contexts. By appreciating cultural uniqueness, embeddedness theory allows indigenous cultures to produce meaningful narratives in their own language, based on their own value definitions, informed by their specific traditional beliefs, and connected to their unique cultural practises. In short, cultural embeddedness research allows each indigenous community to specify and enact their own cultural values.

**Cultural Practises**

Cultural practises are behavioural manifestations of culture. For instance, when asked to consider Hawaiian culture, lū’au feasts and hula dancers are brought to mind. Māori cultural practises include *kapa haka* (Māori performing arts), customs such as *tangihanga* (Māori grieving practises), and speaking the indigenous language. Fluency in cultural practises is salient and observable, so it is often used as an indicator of perceived cultural identity (e.g., Borell, 2005; Durie, 1995). Typically, in-group members consider greater familiarity and fluency in cultural practises as indicators of a strong cultural identity (e.g., Houkamau & Sibley, 2010). The opposite is also true, where those individuals who are not fluent in cultural practises are often regarded as having a ‘weaker’ or marginal cultural identity (Borrell, 2005; Van Meijl, 2006).

Belonging to a marginalised ethnic minority group can be difficult in and of itself, however, individuals from those minority groups who are not fluent in cultural practises can also feel marginalised by other in-group members (Borell, 2005). Since cultural practises are easily identifiable and therefore easy to judge objectively, an indigenous person who lacks knowledge and skills in this area may feel inauthentic or ‘false’ (Van Meijl, 2006). It is no surprise, then, that self-reported cultural ‘efficacy’ (synonymous to fluency) has been found to be positively related to self-esteem for Māori individuals (Matika et al., 2017).

Cultural practises are usually behavioural expressions of cultural values and beliefs based on shared meanings that are deeply rooted in the collective history of a group (e.g., Mead, 2016). The previously mentioned practise of *pōwhiri* are formal welcoming ceremonies that draw on the value of *manaakitanga*. *Pōwhiri* were historically designed to determine whether a visiting tribal group were friend or foe. The cultural practise of *pōwhiri* therefore stems from a history of inter-tribal conflict.

Related to cultural practises are cultural norms. Norms are behavioural expectations of a community, which are collectively agreed upon by the group (often implicitly; Frese, 2015). Cultural practices, then, are actions that reflect cultural norms (i.e., they are expected to occur in formal cultural contexts). However, for indigenous minorities living in colonised societies, it is not always clear when cultural norms are applicable. Indigenous minorities simultaneously belong to their indigenous cultural group *and* the wider social group. So, for indigenous minorities, it can be ambiguous as to which norms apply to a given situation, since the boundaries between majority and indigenous spaces are often blurred. For instance, some Māori see their home as a place where cultural norms are expected, while other Māori will prioritise different norms and values (i.e., religious guidelines derived from the majority culture) in their homes.

**Culturally Valued Behaviours (CVBs)**

While norms depend on cultural contexts, culturally valued behaviours (CVBs) do not. We define CVBs as: *a subset of general everyday behaviours that can occur in any context and are consistent with cultural values.* So, while cultural values are an abstract motivational construct, CVBs are concrete behavioural expressions of those values. Furthermore, because they are *general* behaviours, CVBs occur in all contexts, as opposed to culturally relevant contexts where cultural norms and practises are expected.

We have argued that cultural norms are behavioural expectations that are extended from cultural practises. And since cultural practises are crystallised traditions that are intended to enact cultural values, it follows that cultural norms are also underpinned by cultural values. As such, we expect a significant overlap between cultural norms and CVBs.

The key difference between cultural practises and CVBs are that practises have become crystallised as formal rituals, whereas CVBs are general everyday behaviours that are not constrained by the expectations of cultural contexts. For example, *pōwhiri* usually occur on *marae*. During the pōwhiri process, representatives from both the host and the visiting sides deliver speeches which, among other things, acknowledge their shared history, thereby building meaningful connections to each other. On the other hand, to exemplify the cultural value of *whanaungatanga* (importance of relationships) in a majority culture setting (e.g., a café), a Māori person might engage in a CVB by guiding conversations with a new acquaintance in a way that makes meaningful connections (e.g., finding a shared connection to a person or place), consistent with *whanaungatanga*, but not in a ritualised fashion.

Not only are cultural norms and practises enacted in cultural contexts, they are likely developed there. In other words, we expect that each aspect of cultural embeddedness will be largely developed in clearly demarcated cultural contexts. The model we present next suggests that an indigenous person’s degree of embeddedness will determine their propensity to carry their cultural embeddedness into general majority contexts through the enactment of CVBs. That is, we expect that there will be a strong relationship between cultural embeddedness and one’s propensity to engage in CVBs in the wider society.

**The Dual-Pathways Model of Embeddedness to Culturally Valued Behaviours** **for Indigenous Minorities (DPM)**
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Figure 1. The Dual-Pathways Model of Embeddedness to Culturally Valued Behaviours for Indigenous Minorities (DPM). A theoretical model outlining the dual pathways (left and right sides of the model) through which cultural embeddedness (triangle) leads to culturally valued behaviours (top middle).

In this section we present the Dual Pathways Model of Embeddedness to Culturally Valued Behaviours for Indigenous Minorities (DPM; Figure 1). The DPM is a theoretical model that seeks to explain how components of cultural embeddedness (i.e., the three domains of cultural expression) work together to promote and shape CVBs for indigenous minorities. We propose that there are two distinct but interrelated pathways through which cultural embeddedness leads to CVBs. These are: a) the *implicit pathway*, which springs from cultural values, and b) the *explicit* pathway, which begins with cultural practises.

**The Explicit Pathway**

The first pathway through which cultural embeddedness leads to CVBs is the explicit pathway, which begins with embeddedness in cultural practises. Being embedded in cultural practises means being comfortable and reasonably confident participating in formal cultural settings. Through fluency in cultural traditions and confidence in formal cultural settings, embeddedness in cultural practises supports adherence to cultural norms. Clearly, adherence to cultural norms means intentionally behaving in culturally valued ways (i.e., CVBs), even though these behaviours may be motivated by the external expectations of the culture and cultural contexts.

As we previously noted, it can be difficult to clearly demarcate the boundaries of cultural contexts. Therefore, it can be a subjective matter as to where the behavioural expectations of cultural norms apply. However, indigenous individuals are often triggered by *cultural cues,* which remind them of the expectations of cultural norms, thereby motivating CVBs. For example, it is customary in Māori culture for visitors to provide a *koha* (donation) to the hostmarae, i.e., when visiting grieving *whānau* during *tangihanga* (traditional funerals). In majority cultural contexts such as when a colleague’s family member dies, there may be a call for donations, which triggers the expectancy of providing a *koha.* In this example, providing a *koha* is a CVB that is motivated more by the cultural cue and by external expectations, rather than internal desires. So, in this example, the CVB is largely enacted through the explicit pathway.

In the explicit pathway, conscious, volitional decisions are made regarding when and where an individual will perform CVBs. Attitudes towards one’s heritage culture are therefore part of this decision-making process. Because attitudes are evaluative, those people holding negative attitudes towards their own culture will be less likely to exhibit CVBs, even in cultural contexts or when triggered by cultural cues.

**The Implicit Pathway**

While people are generally aware of the values they hold, they usually operate below consciousness in general, everyday situations (Dinh et al., 2012). The implicit pathway, then, is the implicit process through which embeddedness in cultural values leads to the development of an ingrained desire to embody and enact those values, which subsequently motivates CVBs. It refers to the implicit development of a) personal values (i.e., when cultural values are internalised) and b) characteristic behavioural tendencies (i.e., becoming one who regularly engages in CVBs).

Not only do cultural values usually operate implicitly, they can be developed implicitly too. For example, grandparents who were strongly influenced by culture and cultural values (i.e., serving the community) and who internalised those values into their own self-concept, could then transfer those values to their children/grandchildren by their parenting techniques. So, even if these grandchildren are not explicitly knowledgeable about their cultural heritage, they will still be influenced by long-lived cultural values.

There are, of course, inter-individual variations that can moderate the relationship between embeddedness in cultural values and the embodiment of those values. These include individual differences in psychological characteristics (e.g., traits and cognitions), demographic factors (e.g., age), and social context. On the first count, individual temperament, and personality (e.g., Goldsmith et al., 1987; Chatman & Barsade, 1995) may play a role. For example, although an indigenous person may be embedded in the cultural value of kindness, his highly emotionally volatile personality may cause him to lose his temper and thus fail to enact the value of kindness.

Personal beliefs can also influence the relationship between cultural values and CVBs. A person’s beliefs about what things are true in the world (i.e., worldviews; Koltko-Rivera, 2004) and how the world functions (i.e., social axioms; Leung & Bond, 2004) can clash with cultural values. For example, a person might agree with the cultural value of caring for guests; however, the person might also believe that the world is dangerous, and people can take advantage of your generosity. In this example, the person’s beliefs might inhibit caring behaviours to avoid being exploited.

It is possible for an indigenous person to become culturally embedded later in life as opposed to this process occurring in childhood. In some instances, an adult individual will become newly exposed to the values of their heritage culture and subsequently make personal changes to align themselves with these values. In other cases, an individual may hold *culturally congruent values* (values that are congruent with ethno-cultural values but are underpinned by other entities, i.e., religion) and then, after learning of cultural values, seamlessly connects with them. Cultural values and culturally congruent values are both important because they can each motivate the same behaviours (i.e., CVBs). We therefore suggest that, where both *types* of values co-exist, they will have a cumulative and mutually supportive effect.

**The Role of Cultural Beliefs**

Beliefs typically operate in conjunction with values and practises in cultural systems. As such, beliefs play a crucial role in deepening embeddedness and supporting both pathways of the DPM by increasing an indigenous person’s propensity to explore cultural practises and integrate cultural values. Māori culture, for example, is filled with traditional tribal lore and history, which give meaning to customs, practises, and values. In the example above, the tribal belief of *Tāne* breathing life into the first woman gives meaning to the practise of *hongi* and underpins cultural values such as *mauri ora* (to recognise the inherent value of life; Orbell, 1995).

Cultural beliefs (i.e., cosmological narratives) are not always known or understood by members of the culture. We argue that indigenous minorities who learn about their cultural beliefs will likely enhance their desire to enact cultural practises and embody cultural values as they deepen their own understanding of their cultural heritage.

**The Explanatory Value of the DPM**

Although an individual may be more active in either the explicit or implicit pathway, it is possible for both to be active at a given time. In some cases, an individual will be internally motivated to perform CVBs, in other cases the same individual will be motivated by external expectations, and in most cases CVBs will be motivated by a mix of both internal and external factors.

Of course, there are people with extensive experience in cultural practises, who fail to become embedded in their underlying cultural values. Or perhaps they live in homes that foster incongruent values, diminishing their desire to embody cultural values. Others may have developed negative attitudes towards their heritage culture through friends or through the media, reducing their likelihood of engaging in cultural practises at all. And others still may have fostered personal beliefs that are seemingly incompatible with cultural beliefs, and so, do not allow themselves to become embedded in cultural beliefs. The DPM accounts for these scenarios and provides an explanation for why individuals vary in their intentions and propensity to engage in CVBs, particularly those people with seemingly equivalent cultural backgrounds.

As we have highlighted above, the DPM provides an avenue for understanding the various ways that indigenous minorities navigate their culture and cultural identity, including knowledge of cultural beliefs, adherence to cultural norms, fluency in cultural practises, and the enaction of cultural values. We suggest that as indigenous minorities engage in the explicit and implicit pathways of the DPM, they continually negotiate their cultural self-perception (Houkamau & Sibley, 2010) and their cultural identity position (Rata, 2015).

**Implications of the DPM**

Through the DPM, the present article offers theoretical clarity regarding the ways in which indigenous minorities navigate their cultural identity position during intercultural contact with their post-colonial majority counterparts. The DPM is a unifying model that accounts for the various ways in which indigenous scholars have conceptualised cultural identity (e.g., Houkamau & Sibley, 2010; McIntosh, 2005; Rata, 2015; Weaver, 2001).

We have developed the DPM by utilising the first authors experience as an indigenous Māori person and, as such, we acknowledge its subjectivity and experiential nature. However, the theories and ideas that we introduce in this article call attention to future theoretical, qualitative, and quantitative research to challenge, query, or support the assertions that we have made. We invite further research regarding our model and are particularly interested in the perspectives of other indigenous scholars who have their own experiences navigating indigenous cultural identity while managing intercultural contact with a post-colonial majority.

One key area for future research consideration is how the two pathways of the DPM are uniquely related to other factors. For example, it is possible that the explicit pathway is more closely linked to a positive cultural self-perception compared with the implicit pathway. The explicit pathway might also be more amenable to intervention. However, on the other hand, engagement in the implicit pathway is likely to be more common in individuals who became more deeply embedded in their culture during childhood and adolescence.

Future research might also elaborate on the role of context in the DPM and in an indigenous person’s cultural identity position more generally (Rata, 2015). We have expressed the importance of context and ‘cultural cues’ to an indigenous person’s propensity to engage in CVBs; however, future research might reveal greater detail regarding the features of those contexts and cues and whether there is a threshold of awareness required to influence those behaviours.

A further consideration regarding context is whether engaging in CVBs is appropriate for all situations or if there are situations where they are inappropriate. Navigating intercultural contact can be difficult, and those individuals who are more engaged in the implicit pathway might be less inclined to give consideration to the appropriateness of cultural behaviours for a given context. This situation could result in miscommunication and conflict, which supports the need for both pathways in the DPM.

We acknowledge that the DPM model is built on theoretical suppositions in addition to published qualitative and quantitative evidence. Since no one has tested this proposed model, we intend to undertake future research to update and modify the ideas presented in this article based on empirical data. However, we have opted first to develop a cogent model with strong theoretical foundations, upon which future empirical research can be built. Ensuring that theories are cogent and meaningful from the outset is often overlooked and undervalued in contemporary psychology (Ward, 2019).

The DPM theory has been developed through cultural self-observation, being based on the first author’s indigenous experiences. Observation is the first step towards conceptualisation and theory development, followed by description then explanation (Swedberg, 2016). We are unapologetic about utilising an indigenous perspective to highlight some of the nuances of intercultural contact between indigenous peoples and their post-colonial majority counterparts.
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