

Adaptation to Host Cultures: An Individualist - Collectivist Approach

Suraj Kapoor

Mark E. Comadena Janet Blue

Illinois State University

Abstract

This study involving 314 foreign students attempts to test the universality of value structure theory, determine which values thought to be linked with particular types fit with those types and which do not, ascertain whether the value preferences of foreign students surveyed follow one of two patterns specified as individualist or collectivist, and examine selected social and cultural factors operating in the U.S. in order to determine if these account for differences in value preferences expressed in the population studied.

Schwartz and Bilsky (1990) proposed a "theory of a universal psychological structure of human values" (p. 878). Schwartz (1992) points out that this theory underlines the need to resolve certain basic issues: (a) Do values form some sort of universal set of values? (b) Have we identified a comprehensive set of value types? (c) Do the values have the same or similar meanings among different groups of people under study? The theory also suggests which value types, such as self-direction, are compatible or conflict with others. The value types of self-direction conflicts with that of conformity, for example (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). This theory, which Kang, Kapoor and Wolfe (in press) call "universal values structure theory," has been tested in several cultures. Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) admit, however, that theories such as theirs which "aspire to universality ... must be tested in numerous culturally diverse samples" (p. 1).

This study, using data from foreign students studying in the United States, attempts to (1) test the universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's theory, (2) determine which values thought to be linked with particular value types fit with those types and which do not, (3)

ascertain whether the value preferences of the foreign students sample surveyed follow one of two patterns specified by Triandis (1993, 1990) and others as individualist or collectivist and (4) examine selected social and cultural factors operating in the U.S. in order to determine if these account for differences in value preferences expressed in the population studied.

No single investigation is capable of determining the effect of every social and cultural variable on the value preferences of a given population. We have, therefore, focused on television, a significant cultural institution, in an effort to determine if and how it interacts with other variables such as duration of stay in a foreign country to affect value preferences of these students.

Universal Values Structure

In both of Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987, 1990) studies, Rokeach's (1973) value scale, which is comprised of 36 values, was used. The findings from their studies supported the view that individuals in seven countries -- including the U.S. -- experienced seven distinct value types. They were in Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987, 1990) nomenclature, pro-social, restrictive conformity, enjoyment, achievement, maturity, self-direction, and security. In 1992, Schwartz modified his and Bilsky's types and specified 11 human value types.

The theory also underlined a set of dynamic relationships among the motivational types of values. The proponents of the theory posited that actions be taken in the pursuit of each value types. Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) analyzed the likelihood of conflict or compatibility between value type pairs. From this analysis, the researchers inferred a structure of relations among value types, a structure common to all humans.

Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) reported that the findings for the samples studied suggested that the dynamics of conflict and compatibility among value types had much in common across the seven countries. The scholars not only found strong evidence of compatibility among value types that support self-reliance (self-direction, maturity), self-enhancement (achievement, enjoyment), and self-other relations (security, restrictive conformity, pro-sociality), the researchers also found that these compatibilities recurred in each of the cultures studied.

In 1992, Schwartz modified the early version of the theory in several ways. First, he defined three more potentially universal value types. Next, he developed the possibility that spirituality may constitute another universal type. Finally, he modified the definitions and contents of four of the earlier types (enjoyment, maturity, pro-sociality, security). The modified version has 11 value types (three more than the original eight) (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987, 1990). They are: power,

achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity, universalism, security, and spirituality.

Table 1Value Types, Culture and Value Traits

Value Types	Culture	Value Traits
Power	Individualist	Social Power, Wealth, Authority, Social Recognition, Preserving One's Public Image
Achievement	Individualist	Ambition, Successful, Capable, Intelligent, Influential
Hedonism	Individualist	Pleasure, Enjoyment
Stimulation	Individualist	Varied Life, Exciting and Daring Life
Self-Direction	Individualist	Creativity, Choosing One's Own Goal, Freedom, Curiosity, Independence, Self-Respect
Benevolence	Collectivist	Helpfulness, Responsibility, Forgiving, Honesty, Loyalty, Mature Love, True Friendship
Tradition	Collectivist	Respect for Tradition, Accepting One's Portion in Life, Devout, Humble, Moderate
Conformity	Collectivist	Obedience, Self-Discipline, Politeness, Honoring of Parents and Elders, Maintain Social Order
Universalism	Mixed	Equality, Social Justice, Wisdom, Unity with Nature, World of Beauty, Open-Minded

Security	Mixed	Protection of Natural Environment, Sense of Belonging, Reciprocation of Favors, Family Security, Clean, Healthy, National Security, World at Peace
Spirituality	Mixed	Inner Harmony, Finding Meaning in Life, Detachment, Spiritual Life

As with Schwartz (1990), this study examines the three questions which address the values linked with the eleven motivational value types: (1) Are all of the 11 value types represented in the sample? (2) Are specific values linked with specific value types in the culture of the sample studied? (3) Do any such linkages or the absence of them reinforce or, rather, challenge the putative universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987, 1990) universal values structure theory? The instrument used to survey the value preferences of the population studied combined the 36 values specified by Rokeach (1973) with 20 others identified by Schwartz (1992).

The Individualist-Collectivist Concept

Values serve the interests of individuals or groups. "Societies vary substantially in the emphasis their members give individualistic values versus collectivistic" ones (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990, p. 879). Values that serve individual interests are postulated to be opposed to those that serve collective ones. This postulate undergirds the theory of individualism-collectivism, as developed by Triandis (1993) and others (see Hui and Triandis, 1986; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, and Lucas, 1988; Triandis, Leung, Villareal, and Clark, 1985; Triandis et al., 1986). Prior to these publications, Hofstede (1980) identified one factor he called collectivism-individualism after studying responses from subjects in 66 countries. Triandis et al. (1986) differentiated the factor and found four orthogonal ones related to collectivism-individualism: family integrity and interdependence represent aspects of collectivism, and self-reliance and separation from ingroups represent aspects of individualism.

Collectivists pay more attention to ingroups such as the tribe, the family, the work group, or the nation and behave differently toward members of such groups than toward outgroup members. On the other hand, individualists do not perceive as sharp a distinction between ingroups and outgroups. In individualist cultures, conflicts between ingroup goals and individual goals tend to resolve in favor of the latter. In collectivist cultures, such conflicts tend to resolve in favor of ingroup goals (Triandis, 1990).

In collectivist cultures, both individual and group behavior is regulated largely by ingroup norms. In individualistic cultures, individual likes and dislikes tend to govern

individual behavior; attitudes are pivotal in such cultures. In collectivist cultures, hierarchy and harmony are key. In contrast, individualistic cultures valorize independence from the ingroup and personal achievement.

Triandis, et al. (1990) warn against oversimplification, however, cultures that stress individualist values can support collectivist ones and vice versa. Even within families in either culture, individual family members may prefer individualistic values with respect to matters such as achievement in school or on the job and collectivist values with respect to matters such as environmental equality considered on a local-global-scale.

Triandis (1990) maintains that exposure to contemporary mass media promotes a shift from collectivism to individualism. Our study will also investigate the effect of television viewing on the value preferences of the populations examined.

Foreign Students' Values and Patterns of Television Consumption

The task of adjusting to a new culture is fraught with stress, confusion and anxiety (Furnham and Bochner, 1986; Oberg, 1960), an anxiety that may be reduced by increased contact with a host family. Such contact will enable non-native students to acquire social skills and other awareness (Furnham and Bochner, 1986; Klinberg, 1982). Even so, enculturation via interpersonal communication channels is fraught with frustration and contradiction (Eldridge, 1986), which may account for non-native students' reluctance to seek out host-culture friends (Furnham and Bochner, 1986). Non-native students (NNSs) tend to spend the majority of their leisure time watching television, listening to the radio, and reading newspapers. These practices raise questions about the role played by consumption of U.S. mass media in the socialization of NNSs (see Semlak, 1978).

Several studies have found television to be a potent agent of socialization (see Jhally, 1987 and Comstock, 1980). DeFleur (1970) argues that the mass media operate conservatively and reinforce prevailing tastes and values. In an experimental study, however, Sander and Atwood (1979) found that television is capable of affecting value change. DeFleur (1970) essentially agrees, even though he notes that the media may exercise their capacity for value change infrequently out of fear of alienating their audiences. In 1982, DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach contended that the media may have little ability to change the value structure of individuals, but rather, act as value clarifiers.

Non-native students enter U.S. colleges and universities with their own values. They also hold some firm convictions about Americans and American values. If the media can affect value change, they may well effect such change in particular populations of non-native students. Several studies conclude that television reinforces American values but fails to change those of non-native students (Kapoor and Smith, 1978; Kapoor and Williams, 1978; Maslog, 1971; and Semlak, 1978).

The present project attempts to determine whether residing in a foreign country affects the value perception of non-native students. More precisely, this project proposes

to research: (a) To what extent the values of foreign students from collectivist and individualist cultures change while residing in a primarily individualist culture like the United States, and (b) What role, if any, duration of stay in a foreign culture and exposure to American television play in value conversion or value reinforcement.

Method

A self-administered questionnaire was administered in 1995 to 314 foreign students attending three Midwestern universities. The questionnaire was lengthy and contained items assessing a variety of opinions, knowledge, and media beliefs and habits. It began with value measures in individualism and collectivism from cross-cultural perspectives; basic demographics, such as religion, family structure, political orientation, parental education and occupation as well as students' educational and occupational aspirations. The surveys were mailed to students. Surveys were sent to 500 students, 250 students completed one questionnaire initially. Another, 64 responded as a result of a reminder.

Respondents' value orientations were assessed using a 56 Likert-type scale adapted from a series of value estimates developed by Schwartz (1990). Using factor score coefficients as weights, an orthogonal factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted. Conceptually and empirically, these 56 items were reduced to 11 dimensions of value orientation: four indices of "individualism" dimension, three indices of "collectivism" dimension, three indices of "mixed" dimension, and one index of "spiritual" dimension. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on each set, and in each case only a single factor with an eigenvalue of more than 1.0 was found. The scales yield Cronbach's alphas of at least .53 (and usually higher). The dimensions tapped by the indices are as follows:

Individualism:

Three indices measuring foreign students' individualistic values orientations toward achievement, an index consisting of three variables comprising "intelligent", "capable", and "wisdom" (alpha .65, eigenvalue 2.37 and total variance 44.4%); power, an index consisting of four variables: "social power", "wealth", "authority", and "national security" (alpha .74, eigenvalue 2.37 and total variance 40.4%); stimulation; an index consisting of a six variables "daring", "exciting life", "varied life", "curious", "enjoy life", and "chose own goal" (alpha .80, eigenvalue 5.78 and total variance 29.1%).

Collectivism:

One index that measures the sample's collectivist orientations with respect to conformity consisting of five variables: "honor parents", "loyal", "respect for traditions", "polite" and "honest" (alpha .73 eigenvalue 10.55, and the total

variance 18.8%).

Mixed:

Three indices measure the sample's orientations toward value types which are a blend of collectivism and individualism. These mixed indices are Universalism I, an index which is comprised of four variables: "social justice", "equality", "protecting environment", and a "world at peace" (alpha .72, eigenvalue 3.95, and total variance 36%). Universalism II, an index consisting of three variables: "world of beauty", "creative" and "unity with nature" (alpha .67, eigenvalue 1.69 and total variance 51%).

Spirituality:

No indices could be formulated for the spiritual type, which consists of two variables "spiritual life", and "devout" (alpha .63, eigenvalue 1.79 and total variance 40%).

The independent variable in this study is the amount of television viewing among foreign students. The series of questions about television viewing is extremely detailed. There are questions concerning viewing habits during different times of the week and on weekends, as well as types of programming viewed. For some analysis, the sample was partitioned into light (less than an hour daily; 28%), moderate (1 to 2 hours daily; 47%), to heavy (2 hours or more: 25%) television viewers, with continuous data used in partial correlations.

Among numerous demographic and control variables, duration of stay in the U.S. was also used as an independent variable to analyze their impact on the sample's value orientation.

Results

Means Comparison

Means and standard deviations were computed for the 11 indices. As shown in Table 2, the overall means of the individualist, collectivist, and mixed values reveal that foreign students do not overwhelmingly prefer one value types over another, even though collectivist value type had a higher mean (4.82) than individualist (4.73). However, the mixed value type had the highest mean among the three value types (4.92).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations Values Types

	Number of Values in Index	Mean	S.D.
Individualist Values			
Overall	(25)	4.73	.78
Factors:			
Power	(5)	4.13	1.10
Achievement	(7)	5.15	.88
Hedonism	(4)	4.87	1.44
Stimulation	(4)	4.27	1.26
Self-Direction	(5)	5.23	.87
Collectivist Values			
Overall	(13)	4.82	.86
Factors:			
Benevolence	(7)	5.36	.81
Tradition	(3)	4.19	1.15
Conformity	(3)	4.89	1.03
Mixed Values			
Overall	(9)	4.92	.80
Factors:			
Universality	(5)	4.87	.96
Security	(4)	4.97	.81
Spiritual Values			
Overall	(1)	4.74	1.04

Value Item Rating

Foreign students did not indicate any marked preference for any particular pattern among 56 individualist, collectivist and mixed values. The top ten preferred values represent the three categories evenly, so do the 10 least preferred.

Table 3Value Items by Mean Rating

Type	Value	Mean	Standard deviation
M	Family	5.937	1.175
M	Healthy	5.785	1.291
C	Honest	5.722	1.170
C	True friendship	5.715	1.225
I	Successful	5.620	1.125
I	Choosing goals	5.589	1.188
I	Self respect	5.576	1.281
S	Inner harmony	5.570	1.368
C	Loyal	5.563	1.184
S	Meaning in life	5.532	1.327
I	Intelligent	5.519	1.264
I	Capable	5.487	1.223
I	Freedom	5.462	1.317
C	Responsible	5.437	1.211
C	Honor of one's parents	5.392	1.499
M	Wisdom	5.278	1.323
M	World at peace	5.259	1.590
I	Independent	5.234	1.320
M	Broad- mindedness	5.228	1.456
I	Ambitious	5.152	1.487
I	Enjoy life	5.133	1.739
C	Nature love	5.120	1.654
M	Equality	5.082	1.524
M	Social justice	5.032	1.326
C	Helpful	4.994	1.369
I	Social recognition	4.994	1.350
C	Forgiving	4.981	1.359
M	Sense of Belonging	4.943	1.449
C	Politeness	4.880	1.359
I	Curious	4.861	1.510
C	Self discipline	4.829	1.570
M	Clean	4.772	1.621
M	Social order	4.766	1.408
I	Creativity	4.646	1.504
I	A varied life	4.646	1.457
I	Pleasure	4.601	1.490
I	An exciting life	4.595	1.452

M	World of beauty	4.595	1.491
C	Obedience	4.589	1.496
C	Humble	4.582	1.630
I	Wealth	4.513	1.597
I	Preserving one's public image	4.405	1.594
S	Spiritual life	4.399	1.858
M	Unity with nature	4.348	1.613
M	National security	4.335	1.708
C	Accepting of one's position in life	4.329	1.684
M	Reciprocation of favours	4.259	1.562
M	Protection of the environment	4.253	1.601
C	Respect for tradition	4.241	1.736
C	Moderate	4.165	1.621
I	Influential	3.975	1.465
C	Devout	3.652	1.958
I	Authority	3.652	1.660
I	Daring	3.582	1.594
S	Detachment	3.443	1.639
I	Social power	3.063	1.592

Analysis of Variance

TV Exposure:

Concerning individualism, collectivism, mixed and spiritual dimensions; television exposure appears to affect a statistically significant difference in value preference, as heavy viewers of television judging by higher means (5.04 to 4.58 for medium and 4.69 for low viewers) seem to prefer individualist values. The heavy viewers also seem to prefer spirituality as indicated by statistically significant differences between them and medium and low TV viewers. Our study did not find any significant differences between the three groups of TV viewers in indicating preference for collectivist and mixed values.

Table 4

Analysis of Variance Type Scores by Levels of TV Exposure

Group 1 - Low
 Group 2 - Medium
 Group 3 - High

Individualism Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	90	4.6973	.7038		
Group 2	150	4.5893	.8427	8.9622	.0002
Group 3	76	5.0423	.6635		
Total	316	4.7290	.7836		

Collectivism Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	90	4.7314	.7776		
Group 2	150	4.8432	.9025	.6110	.5434
Group 3	76	4.8604	.8672		
Total	316	4.8155	.8591		

Mixed Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	90	4.8849	.8176		
Group 2	150	4.8642	.7769	1.9807	.1397
Group 3	76	5.0789	.8195		
Total	316	4.9209	.8014		

Spirituality Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	90	4.8722	.9416		
Group 2	150	4.5667	1.0731	3.8605	.0221
Group 3	76	4.9079	1.0495		
Total	316	4.7358	1.0409		

Gender:

Our study finds that there are statistically significant and consistent differences among male and female foreign students in their preference of the value types. Female students in our sample are far less individualistic than males and conversely opt for more collectivist values.

Table 5Analysis of Value Type Scores by Gender

Individualism Value Type					
	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	148	4.8734	.6451	9.7151	.0020
Group 2	168	4.6018	.8701		
Total	316	4.7290	.7836		
Collectivism Value Type					
	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	148	4.6153	.8065	15.8239	.0001
Group 2	168	4.9918	.8677		
Total	316	4.8155	.8591		
Mixed Value Type					
	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	148	4.7278	.7986	16.9828	.0000
Group 2	168	5.0910	.7668		
Total	316	4.9209	.8014		
Spirituality Value Type					
	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	148	4.4595	1.0683	20.8498	.0000
Group 2	168	4.9792	.9550		
Total	316	4.7358	1.0409		

Note: Group 1 is male. Group 2 is female.

Duration of Stay in U.S.:

Our study does not reveal any consistent pattern in value preference based on foreign students' duration of stay in the United States. Students residing in the United States for 2 to 4 years have higher mean scores in all value types compared to those who have stayed here for fewer or more years. One reason the variable duration of stay did not seem to impact value preference could be that the overwhelming number of foreign students in our sample had resided in the United States only for a brief duration.

Table 6

Analysis of Variance of Value Types by Duration
of Stay in the United States

Group 1 - 1 month to 2 years

Group 2 - 2.1 years to 4 years

Group 3 - 4.1 years to 6 or more years

Individualism Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	236	4.7032	.7864	3.0667	.0480
Group 2	58	4.9264	.8359		
Group 3	22	4.4861	.4634		
Total	316	4.7290	.7836		

Collectivism Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	236	4.7383	.8538	4.5232	.0116
Group 2	58	5.1113	.8303		
Group 4	22	4.8632	.8557		
Total	316	4.8155	.8591		

Mixed Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	236	4.8599	.8201	3.7160	.0254
Group 2	58	5.1770	.7973		
Group 3	22	4.9000	.3993		
Total	316	4.9209	.8014		

Spirituality Value Type

	Count	Mean	Stand dev	F ratio	F prob
Group 1	236	4.7415	1.0200	.0332	.9674
Group 2	58	4.7328	1.1001		
Group 3	22	4.6818	1.1500		
Total	316	4.7358	1.0409		

Value Structure:

Based on Triandis, Hofstede and others' classification, the samples of foreign students was divided into individualist and collectivist categories. Students from India, China, Japan, Nigeria and Mexico--totalling 274-- were placed in the collectivists' group and students from Europe and Australia--totalling 40-- were included in the individualists' group. Using t-tests, the two groups' preference for 56 values was computed. The findings reveal that only on 28 out of 56 values was there a statistically significant difference between the two groups' preferences. Out of the 28 values, 24 were collectivist and only 4 were individualist values. Further, only 12 values (honest, moderate, respect for tradition, obedient, self-discipline, humble, politeness, mature love, helpful, varied life, daring and exciting life) fall into the individualist, collectivist, and mixed value types as developed by Schwartz (1990). This data analysis again indicates that the foreign student population did not follow a consistent pattern in value preference. This finding differs substantially from the results of American and Indian studies in which the students studied opted for collectivist and individualist values respectively.

Discussion and Conclusion

The current study had four major objectives: (1) to test the universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987, 1990) universal values structure theory, (2) to determine which values thought to be linked with particular value types are joined together by the sample of foreign students, (3) to ascertain whether the value preferences of the foreign students conform to one of two patterns specified by Triandis (1990) and others as individualist or collectivist, and finally (4) to assess the effects of such social variables as gender, duration of stay, and such cultural ones as television viewing on the value preferences of the population studied.

Our study found statistically significant correlations among individualist, collectivist, and mixed value types. In all, 28 of 56 values are joined together within the collectivist, individualist, and mixed value types, specified by Schwartz (1992), in the foreign students sample. The findings, however, offer a qualified support for the salience of Schwartz's (1992) individualistic, collectivist, and mixed value types with respect to the population studied as only 50 percent of the values are joined together. This finding sharply deviates from the results of similar investigations done on American (Kapoor, Wolfe, Blue 1995, Kapoor, Blue 1995) and India (Kang, Kapoor, 1995, in print) students populations. In the American study, 82 percent of the values were joined together, whereas in the Indian sample 70 percent of the same preferences were placed in the expected categories. The fact that far fewer values were joined in the foreign students sample may be attributable to the amalgamation of students from 15 countries in the population being investigated. In any event, this finding underlines the need for testing the

theory of universal structure of values in various cultures and sub-cultures before assigning it the status of universality.

The findings of this investigation differ from the conclusions of American and Indian projects in a couple of other areas as well. The American students surveyed preferred individualist and mixed values over the collectivist type. On the other hand Indian students belonging to a collectivist culture opted for collectivist and mixed value types. The findings of the foreign students investigation differ considerably in this respect. Foreign students do not overwhelmingly prefer one value type over another. If anything, they are slightly partial to mixed value type.

The same pattern holds in the rating of 56 individualist, collectivist and mixed values. Whereas Indian and American samples are partial to collectivist and individualist values respectively, foreign students in general opt for mixed values.

Despite the marked differences in the three investigations, results reveal enough anomalies so as to render any clear cut pattern invisible beyond the broad inclination of our sample toward collectivist (Indian sample), individualist (the American population), and mixed (foreign students) types. Rather, they suggest the inadequacy of individualism-collectivism dichotomy. As Schwartz (1990, p.151) has noted, the dichotomy first:

leads us to overlook values that inherently serve both individual and collectivist interests. Second, the dichotomy ignores values that foster the goals of collectivists other than the ingroup (e.g. pro-social values). Third, the dichotomy promotes the mistaken assumption that individualist and collectivist values each form coherent syndromes that are opposed to one another. It fails to recognize that the subtypes of individualist-collectivist values sometimes do not vary together and are sometimes not opposed.

Triandis (1993), whose work has employed the value types, recently concedes that all humans are both individualistic and collectivist. "Individualism and collectivism can coexist and simply emphasize a culture depending upon the situation" (1993, p. 162). Schwartz (1990) stresses the need for refining these concepts and the instruments formulated to measure them. Gudykunst (1992) suggests that relational and personality factors moderate the influence of individualism and collectivism on ingroup and outgroup communication.

Perhaps a very significant finding in this study for the development of universal value structure theory is the importance of social and cultural variables in accounting for variations of expressed value preference. Two variables in particular appear to play a substantial role in value preference in the present project. First, television exposure appears to be a significant contributor to differences in value preference as heavy television viewers show a statistically significant preference for individualist values. This finding supports the results of a similar study (Kang, Kapoor and Wolfe, 1995) involving

Indian students. In that study it was found that heavy television viewing contributed to preference for individualist values. However, a study using the same instrument involving American students reached different conclusions as heavy, medium and low television viewers did not seem to have any priority in selecting individualist, collectivist or mixed value types.

Further investigation is needed to explain why television does not perpetuate individualist values in a primarily individualist country like the United States and does so in a limited way in a primarily collectivist country like India. Is it possible that Americans have been exposed to television for such a long time that the desensitization process has set in whereas Indian students--for whom American television programs are a novelty--are eager to embrace the individualist values perpetuated by the American fare?

Second, the independent variable gender, which had a relatively balanced representation of both males and females in the present study, accounts for a consistent finding pointing to females being a lot less individualistic in their value preferences than males.

Finally, the findings of our study offer a qualified endorsement for the universal structure of human values, including the value types. However, our research provides very limited support for labeling any block of countries as individualist or collectivist, based primarily on the people's value preference. The sample in our study seems to embrace mixed values. To that extent, our study once again lends support to Triandis' proposition that individualism and collectivism value descriptions might be independent and orthogonal, but not necessarily mutually exclusive.

References

- Comstock, G.
1980 *Television in America*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- DeFleur, M.
1970 *Theories of Mass Communication*. New York: McKay.
- DeFleur, M. & Rokeach, B.
1982 *Theories of Mass Communication*. Longman, N.Y.
- Eldridge, J.
1986 Overseas students at Leicester University: Some problems in adjustment and communication. *Race*. 2, 50-9.
- Furnham, A., & Bochner, S.
1986 *Cultural shock, psychological reactions to unfamiliar environments*. Metheun: NY.
- Gudyknust, W.
1992 The influence of individualism-collectivism, self-monitoring, and predicted -

- outcome value on communication in in-group and out-group relationships. *Journal of Cross - cultural Psychology*. 23, 196-213.
- Hofstede, G.
1980 *Culture's Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hui, C., & Triandis, H.
1986 Individualism - collectivism: A study of cross - cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross - Cultural Psychology*. 23, 196-213.
- Jhally, S.
1987 *The Codes of Advertising*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kang, J., Kapoor, S., & Wolfe, A.
1995 The impact of television viewing on the values orientations of Indian students: an Individualist - Collectivist approach. *Howard Journal of Communication*, in press.
- Kapoor, S., & Blue, J.
1995 Universal value structure and individualist - collectivist dichotomy re-evaluated. Paper presented at the Intercultural and Developmental Communication Division of the International Communication Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico. May.
- Kapoor, S., & Smith, R.
1978 The role of communication in the acculturation of foreign students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, Philadelphia, PA.
- Kapoor, S. & Williams, W.
1978 The socialization of television and foreign students' value orientation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of A.F. J., Houston, TX.
- Kapoor, S., Wolfe, A. & Blue, J.
1995 Universal values structure and individualism - collectivism: A U.S. test. *Communication Research Reports*. 12, 112-22.
- Klinberg, O.
1982 Contact between ethnic groups. In Bochner, S. (ed.). *Cultures in contact: Studies in Cross - Cultural Interaction*. Pergamon, Oxford.
- Maslog, C.H.
1971 Images and the mass media. *Journalism Quarterly*. 48, 519-25.
- Oberg, K.L.
1960 Cultural Shock: Adjustments to new culture environment. *Practical Anthropology*. 7, 177-82.
- Rokeach, M.
1973 *The Nature of Human Values*. Free Press: New York.
- Sander, R., & Atwood, E.

- 1979 Value change initiated in the mass media. In Rokeach, M. *Understanding Human Values, Individual and Social*. Free Press: New York.
- Schwartz, S.
1992 Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical advances in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Psychology*. 1-66.
- Schwartz, S.
1990 Individualism-Collectivism critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 39-157.
- Schwartz, S. & Bilsky, W.
1990 Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 58, 872-91.
- Schwartz, S. & Bilsky W.
1987 Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 53, 550-62.
- Semlak, W.
1978 Efforts of media use on foreign students' perceptions of U.S. political leaders. *Journalism Quarterly*. 55, 125-9.
- Triandis, H.
1993 Collectivism and Individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross Cultural Research*. 27, 155-180.
- Triandis, H.
1990 Cross-cultural studies of Individualism and Collectivism. In J. Berman (ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M., Asai, M., & Lucas, N.
1988 Individualism and Collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self in group relationships. *Journal of Research and Personality*. 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, M., & Monmlooin, G.
1986 The measurement of etic aspects of Individualism and Collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*. 38, 257-67.
- Triandis, H., Leung, K., Villareal, M., & Clark, F.
1985 Allocentric vs. Idiocentric tendencies: convergent and discriminate validation. *Journal of Research and Personality*. 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H., McCusker, C., & Hui, M.
1990 Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 59, 1006-20.