

Validation of Intercultural Sensitivity Measure Individualism – Collectivism

Mark Comadena
Illinois State University

Suraj Kapoor
Illinois State University

Catherine Konsky
Illinois State University

Janet Blue
Illinois State University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore the validity of using the individualism-collectivism construct to examine two areas: (a) classify cultures of the world and to, (b) determine if the individualism-collectivism construct could be used to measure intercultural sensitivity. The study found that there are inadequacies of conceptualizing individualism and collectivism as a dichotomy.

The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI, Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992) was developed to address a need in the scholarly literature for a reliable and valid measure of this theoretically significant construct. As organizations expand their global initiatives with more employees required to relocate in cultures different from their own, issues of intercultural sensitivity are likely to figure even more prominently in the research literature.

Problems associated with the impact of failed adjustment (Church, 1982; Ward & Searle, 1991; Kealey, 1989) and the impact of failed acculturation on the business world (Bhawuk & Brislin 1992) forecast the need not only for greater understanding of intercultural sensitivity but also for training programs designed to develop a greater level of sensitivity. Measurement of intercultural sensitivity are at the core of these initiatives as well as to develop a greater level of sensitivity. Measurement of intercultural sensitivity is at the core of these initiatives. In developing their ICSI (Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory) instrument, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) evaluated various predictors used to estimate intercultural effectiveness of overseas personnel. "ICSI is a self-report instrument in which people give their response ..." (Bhawuk & Brislin 1992, p. 420). The instruments

items were developed from “100 critical incidents designed for cross-cultural orientation programs” (Brislin, *et al.* 1986). Statements which comprise the ICSI instrument were developed to “capture behaviors rather than attitudes or traits” and “to measure the ability of people to modify behavior while moving from one culture to another” (Bhawuk & Brislin 1992, p. 420). They found, as did Kealey and Ruben (1983), that empathy, respect, interest in local culture, flexibility, tolerance, and technical skill are important factors in overseas success. Other criteria contributing to success abroad included open-mindedness, sociability, positive self-image, and initiative. However, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) contended that while technical skill, initiative, sociability, and positive self-image could be determined by measures success in one’s own country, it is more difficult to measure empathy, flexibility, sojourner open-mindedness, respect and tolerance for people from other cultures because valid measure must assess on some level the capacity, if not the propensity to engage in what is judged to be “sensitive” behavior from a different perspective. According to Bhawuk and Brislin (1992). “To be effective in other cultures, people must be interested in other cultures, be sensitive enough to notice cultural differences, and then also be willing to modify their behavior as an indication of respect for people of other cultures. A reasonable term that summarized these qualities of people is intercultural sensitivity, and we suggest that it may be a predictor of effectiveness.” (p.416).

One way to measure intercultural sensitivity is to determine whether people can modify their behavior appropriately and successfully when moving from one culture to another. To guide the development of their instrument, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) considered it essential to identify a dimension that not only differentiates groups and cultures but is also associated with specific patterns of behavior in cultures. They selected individualism-collectivism as that dimension for categorizing cultures because a line of research clearly establishes its ability to distinguish cultures along value lines.

Individualism-Collectivism

According to the individualism-collectivism dichotomy, values serve the interests of individuals or of groups. Proponents of this perspective assert: “Societies vary substantially in the emphasis their members give individualistic values versus collectivist” ones (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990, p. 879). Values that serve individual interests are postulated to be opposed to those that serve collective interest, creating a kind of cultural juxtaposition. This postulate undergirds the theory of individualism- collectivism as developed by Triandis (1993) and others (see Hui & Triandis, 1986; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucas, 1988; Triandis, Leung, Villareal & Clark, 1985; Triandis *et al.*, 1986). Hofstede (1980) provided the foundation for this research when he identified one factor which he

called collectivism-individualism based on the 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 representing aspects of collectivism, and self-reliance and separation from in-groups represent aspects of individualism. These distinctions have become hallmarks in refining the conceptual definitions. (See Kapoor, Wolfe & Blue, 1995; Kang, Kapoor & Wolfe, 1995; Gudykunst, 1992; Schwartz, 1990).

According to Triandis (1990), collectivists pay more attention to in-groups such as the tribe, the family, the work group or the nation and behave differently toward members of such groups than toward out-group members. On the other hand, individualists do not perceive a sharp distinction between in-groups and out-groups. In individualistic cultures, conflicts between in-group goals and individual goals tend to be resolved in favor of the individual; whereas, in collectivist cultures, such conflicts tend to be resolved in favor of in-group goals (Triandis, 1990).

In collectivist cultures, both individual and group behavior are regulated largely by in-group norms. In individualistic cultures, however, individual likes and dislikes tend to govern individual behavior; individuals' attitudes are pivotal in such cultures. In collectivist cultures, hierarchy and harmony are key. In contrast, individualistic cultures valorize independence from the in-group and personal achievement. However, Triandis (1990) warns against oversimplification because, cultures that stress individualist values can support collectivist ones and vice versa. We selected the United States and India to represent individualism and collectivism respectively. Based on the findings of several studies conducted in the last two decades. (See Triandis, 1990; Triandis, 1993; Singelis, *et al.* 1995; Kapoor, Wolfe & Blue, 1995; Kang, Kapoor & Wolfe, 1995). These investigations indicate that in individualist country like the United States, emphasis is placed on individualist traits like success, achievement and freedom. Whereas in a collectivist culture such as India, obedience to group interests, interdependence and loyalty are the preferred value orientation.

In summary, the purpose of the present study was to explore the validity of using the individualism-collectivism construct to (a) classify cultures of the world and to (b) determine if individualism-collectivism construct could be used to measure intercultural sensitivity. The following research questions were addressed in this project:

1. Can individualism-collectivism be used as a construct for measuring intercultural sensitivity?
2. Is the ICSI a construct valid measure of intercultural sensitivity?
3. Does the individualism-collectivism measure accurately describe the value orientations of collectivist and individualist cultures?

Method

Data were collected from 256 American undergraduate respondents from a large Mid Western University in the United States, an individualist culture, and 269 undergraduate students living in India, a collectivist culture. Research questionnaires were administered in the respondents' classrooms. Respondents were asked to complete the Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) intercultural sensitivity measure (ICSI). The ICSI contains 32 Likert-type items designed to assess one's sensitivity to differences or point of view of people from other cultures. The American respondents were asked to respond to 16 items as American residents, and then respond to the same 16 item statement by imagining that they were living in India. The Indian participants were asked to respond to the same 16 items, first as Indians living and working in India, and then rate the 16 items by imagining that they were living in the United States. Finally, participants completed Triandis and Waters (1992) Individualism-Collectivism measure. This instrument is composed of 21 Likert-type items designed to assess the extent to which one maintains individualist or collectivist values.

Results

The 32 item ICSI had an internal reliability estimate of .78 for the American sample and .85 for the Indian sample (Cronbach's alpha). The first 16 items of the instrument, which asked subjects to evaluate from their own cultural perspective, had an internal reliability of .76 for the American sample and .56 for the Indian sample. The second set of 16 items, which asked subjects to evaluate from the other cultural perspective, (either the United States or India), had an internal reliability of .76 for the American sample and .56 for the Indian sample. Finally, the flexibility-openness items of the ICSI were found to have reliability estimates of .65 for the American sample and .55 for the Indian sample. Analysis of the 21-item Individualism-Collectivism measure produced internal reliability estimates (Cronbach's alpha) of .75 for the American sample and .57 for the Indian sample. The authors felt the .75 reliability score for the American sample was close enough to accept all factors that fell within this range. In reference to the Indian sample, the authors felt the .57 internal reliability score may be low due to the translation factor and the lack of understanding of terms from the Indian participants.

Factor Analysis

Factor analyses were performed on both the American and Indian data. In all analyses, a varimax rotation method was used with the minimum score to be included if one factor was $\geq .50$ (confirmatory analysis using $\geq .60$ showed very little difference in the pattern which resulted from the original analysis). Scree tests

were used to determine the actual number of factors to be used in the final analysis.

In the American/American samples the respondents were asked to respond as American's residing in America. Factor analysis resulted in the final number of factors as four. Factor 1 loaded four variables, two were individualistic and two were collectivist, with an Eigenvalue of 3.78. Factor 2 loaded two variables of which one was individualistic and one was collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 1.59. Factor 3 loaded four variables, three individualistic and one collectivist, with an Eigenvalue of 1.39 and finally, Factor 4 loaded two variables, one individualistic and one collectivist, with an Eigenvalue of 1.15.

Next, the American respondents were asked to answer the questions as if they were residing in India. The American/Indian sample had four factors as well. Factor 1 loaded four variables, three individualistic and one collectivist, with an Eigenvalue of 3.62. Factor 2 loaded two variables both which were collectivist in nature and had an Eigenvalue of 2.06. Factor 3 loaded two variables that were both collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 1.61, and finally, Factor 4 loaded four variables, three that were individualistic and one collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 1.29.

In the Indian/Indian sample, the participants were asked to answer the questions as living in India. The final number was four factors. Factor 1 loaded four variables which two were individualistic and two were collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 2.58. Factor 2 loaded three variables which all three being individualistic with an Eigenvalue of 1.87. Factor 3 loaded two variables, both being collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 1.55. Finally, Factor 4 loaded two variables, one individualistic and one collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 1.37. Finally, for the Indian/American sample, the Indian participants were asked to answer the questions as if they were residing in the United States. This sample had four factors. Factor 1 loaded four variables, two individualistic and two collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 2.63. Factor 2 contained three variables, all of which were individualistic, and an Eigenvalue of 2.18. Factor 3 held three variables, two individualistic and one collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 1.60. Finally, Factor 4 contained three variables, two individualistic and one collectivist with an Eigenvalue of 1.54. The authors decided not to utilize the MCA test since the present study's intent is to replicate an earlier study. The MCA test was not part of the data analysis of earlier studies.

ICSI. American participants' intercultural sensitivity orientations were assessed through confirmatory factor analysis. Utilizing principle components analysis with a varimax rotation, a variable was considered part of a factor if it had a loading score of .5 or more. Using factor score coefficients as weight, orthogonal factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted. The factor analysis of American participants' perceptions of their behavior in their own country identified

four factors. One factor contained two collectivist items and two individualist item. Another factor contained three collectivist items. The remaining two factors contained three individualist items and the last factor contained two individualistic items. In summary, the American participants accepted 12 of the 16 statements. The factor analysis of the American participant's perceptions of their behavior if they lived or worked in India produced four factors. The first factor contained one collectivist item and three individualist items. Factors two and three contained two collectivist items each. The remaining factor contained one collectivist item and three individualist items. Again, the American participants subscribed to 12 of the possible 16 items.

Table 1

Results of Factor Analysis: American Students' Perceptions in United States

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	11(I)	4 (C)	1 (I)	3 (I)
	14 (I)	8 (C)	6 (I)	9 (I)
	15 (C)	12 (C)	7 (I)	
	16 (C)			
Eigenvalue =	3.78	1.59	1.39	1.15
Variance =	23.6	9.9	8.7	7.2
Alpha =	.69	.70	.48	.41

Notes: I = Individualist item & C = Collectivist item

Table 2

Results of Factor Analysis: American Students' Perception in India

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	3 (I)	2 (C)	4 (C)	1(I)
	9 (I)	15 (C)	12 (C)	6 (I)
	14 (I)			7 (I)
	16 (C)			8 (C)
Eigenvalue =	3.62	2.06	1.61	1.29
Variance =	22.7	12.9	10.0	8.0
Alpha = .70	.55	.72	.50	

Notes: I = Individualist item & C = Collectivist item

The factor analysis performed on Indian respondents' perceptions of their behavior in their own country produced four factors. Factor one contained two collectivist items and two individualist items. Factor two contained three items that were all individualistic, with factor three contained two collectivist items. Factor four contained one collectivist and one individualist item. Indian respondents accepted 11 of the 16 items. The factor analysis of the Indian respondents' perceptions of their behavior if they lived or worked in the United States produced four factors. Factor one contained two collectivist items and two individualist items. Factor two contained three items which were all individualist. Factor 3 contained three items, two individualist and one collectivist item. Finally, factor four contained one collectivist item and two individualist item. Indian students accepted 13 of the 16 items.

Table 3

Results of Factor Analysis: Indian Students' Perceptions in India

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	10 (C)	3 (I)	4 (C)	1 (I)
	11 (I)	6 (I)	5 (C)	2 (C)
	13 (I)	14 (I)		
	16 (C)			
Eigenvalue =	2.58	1.87	1.55	1.37
Variance =	16.2	11.7	9.7	8.6

Notes: I = Individualist item & C = Collectivist item

Table 4

Results of Factor Analysis: Indian Students' Perceptions in United States

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	4 (C)	1 (I)	3 (I)	5 (C)
	6 (I)	7 (I)	9 (I)	13 (I)
	11 (I)	8 (C)	12 (C)	14 (I)
	16 (C)			
Eigenvalue=	2.63	2.18	1.60	1.54
Variance =	16.4	13.6	10.0	9.6

Note: I = Individualist item & C = Collectivist item

American Individualist-Collectivist Perception: Four indices were identified for

American participants' individualist-collectivist perception. Factors one and two contained four items, three of which were individualistic and one mixed item. The four items found in factor three were all collectivist items with factor four having only two items, one collectivist and one individualistic. In total, the American participants accepted 14 of the 21 items on the scale.

Table 5

Results of Factor Analysis: American Students' Perceptions of Behavior

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	10 (I)	5 (I)	2 (C)	8 (C)
	19 (I)	6 (M)	4 (C)	9 (I)
	20 (M)	7 (I)	15 (C)	
	21 (I)	18 (I)	16 (C)	
Eigenvalue =	3.69	2.60	1.63	1.35
Variance =	17.6	12.4	7.8	6.4
Alpha =	.71	.59	.62	.50

Note: I = Individualist item, C= Collectivist item & M = Mixed item

Indian Individualist-Collectivist Perception: As with the Americans, four indices were identified for the Indian respondents' individualist-collectivist perception. Factor one contained one individualistic item and two mixed items. Factor two contained three items, two individualistic and one mixed item. Factor three held two items of which both were individualistic, with factor four having two items, one individualistic and one collectivist. Overall, Indian respondents accepted only 10 of the 21 items of the individualistic-collectivist scale.

Table 6

Results of Factor Analysis: Indian Students' Perceptions of Behavior

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
	14 (M)	11 (M)	17 (I)	9 (I)
	19 (I)	12 (I)	5 (I)	2 (C)
	20 (M)	21 (I)		
Eigenvalue =	2.70	2.42	1.93	1.80
Variance =	12.8	11.5	9.2	8.6
Alpha =	.75	.46	.43	.24

Note: I = Individualist item, C= Collectivist item & M = Mixed item

Item Mean Comparisons

ICSI. A comparison of ICSI item means for American participants revealed that three of the five items with the highest means are individualist statements and three of the lowest five were collectivist statements. In reference to American participant's perceptions of their behavior in the Indian culture, three of the five statements with the highest means were collectivist, with only two of the five statements with the lowest means being collectivist.

Table 7

Mean Scores and Standard Deviation Scores: American Perception of Behavior

Item	Own		Other	
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D.
1 (I)	4.2	1.6	3.8	1.8
2 (C)	3.5	1.8	4.7	1.9
3 (I)	5.3	1.3	4.6	1.7
4 (C)	4.6	1.6	4.1	1.8
5 (C)	4.3	1.4	4.3	1.8
6 (I)	3.4	1.6	3.6	1.7
7 (I)	3.1	1.5	3.6	1.7
8 (C)	3.3	1.7	3.9	1.9
9 (I)	4.9	1.8	4.3	1.9
10 (C)	3.3	1.8	4.2	2.0
11 (I)	4.5	1.6	4.2	1.7
12 (C)	4.0	1.7	3.9	1.8
13 (I)	4.7	1.6	4.7	1.7
14 (I)	5.5	1.4	4.8	1.7
15 (C)	5.5	1.3	5.4	1.5
16 (C)	4.8	1.4	4.8	1.6

Note: I – Individualist item & C = Collectivist item

Indian respondents appear to perceive themselves as collectivists as reflected by the fact that two of the five highest means statements are collectivist and two of the five lowest means statements are collectivist. When the Indian respondents were asked to perceive themselves living or working in the United States, the results were very similar to the results when the Indian respondents perceived themselves living and working in India. Two of the five statements with the highest means were collectivist and two of the five statements with the lowest means were collectivist.

Table 8

Mean Scores and Standard Deviation Scores: Indian Perception of Behavior

Item	Own		Other	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1 (I)	3.6	1.9	3.4	2.1
2 (C)	5.1	1.9	4.5	1.8
3 (I)	5.0	1.6	5.4	1.7
4 (C)	4.6	1.9	4.6	1.8
5 (C)	4.2	1.8	4.1	1.8
6 (I)	3.1	1.8	2.8	1.7
7 (I)	3.2	1.6	3.0	1.7
8 (C)	3.6	2.0	3.8	1.8
9 (I)	4.4	1.9	4.9	1.8
10 (C)	3.5	1.9	3.0	2.1
11 (I)	4.8	1.6	4.7	1.9
12 (C)	3.9	1.9	3.7	2.0
13 (I)	5.0	1.6	4.7	1.5
14 (I)	5.3	1.5	5.4	1.6
15 (C)	5.2	1.4	5.4	1.6
16 (C)	4.6	1.6	4.8	1.7

Note: I – Individualist item & C = Collectivist item

Individualist-Collectivist Orientations: American participants viewed themselves as having more of a collectivist perception. Of the five statements with the highest means, three of those were collectivist in nature. However, of the five statements with the lowest means, three were individualistic with the remaining two being mixed. The Indian respondents had a mixed perception of what their orientation may be. Of the five statements with the highest means, one was individualistic, three were collectivist items with one being mixed orientation. Similarly, of the five statements with the lowest mean, four were individualistic and one being a mixed value item.

Table 9

Mean Scores of American and Indian Students

Item	American		Indian	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1 (I)	4.1	1.9	5.5	1.8
2 (C)	5.4	1.5	5.4	1.5
3 (I)	3.3	1.8	4.4	1.7
4 (C)	5.3	1.5	5.6	1.4

5	(I)	4.8	1.6	4.9	2.1
6	(M)	4.6	1.4	5.3	1.7
7	(I)	4.3	1.7	4.1	1.8
8	(C)	3.5	1.7	5.3	1.8
9	(I)	4.5	1.7	5.0	1.7
10	(I)	2.4	1.5	4.0	2.0
11	(M)	3.4	1.8	3.4	1.8
12	(I)	5.2	1.5	5.2	1.9
13	(I)	4.4	1.6	5.1	1.7
14	(M)	3.6	1.9	3.8	2.2
15	(C)	4.1	1.6	3.6	1.7
16	(C)	5.4	1.8	4.2	1.7
17	(I)	4.9	1.5	4.9	1.8
18	(I)	4.2	1.7	5.2	1.7
19	(I)	2.4	1.7	2.8	2.2
20	(M)	2.6	1.7	3.0	2.2
21	(I)	3.6	1.6	3.7	1.6

Note: I = Individualist item, C = Collectivist item & M = Mixed item.

Discussion

Our study found fairly high reliability for the intercultural sensitivity scale among both American and Indian students. The findings of this study also indicate support, although qualified, for the construct validity of the ICSI. When American and Indian students were asked to evaluate their behavior in their own country, 12 of the 16 items loaded on four factors. Similarly, when American and Indians were asked to rate these same items as residents of the other culture, 12 out of 16 items loaded on four factors.

These results point to a stronger support for the construct validity of the ICSI in comparison with the findings of a similar study involving American and Mexican students (Kapoor & Comadena, 1996). In that study only 8 of the 16 items loaded. Also when Mexican students were asked to rate these items as residents of the United States, varimax rotation failed to converge any indices. However, in the present study, as was the case with the 1996 study, the construct validity support is qualified, since a number of individualist and collectivist items loaded on four factors with no clear cut pattern emerging.

As for the validity of the individualism-collectivism measure, our study indicates strong but conditional endorsement in the case of American students, however, comparatively is limited support involving the Indian sample. Overall, the support remains conditional for both groups because the indices created are not exclusively individualist or collectivist.

Although our findings in no way repudiate the claim by Hofstede (1980) and others that the United States and India are individualist and collectivist cultures respectively. Results from mean comparisons and t-tests clearly show that American and Indian students, on the whole, opt for individualist and collectivist orientations. But, our results reveal anomalies that render any clear-cut pattern invisible beyond the inclination of our samples toward individualist and collectivist types. Rather, the results provide empirical support for the inadequacy of conceptualizing individualism and collectivism as a dichotomy.

As Schwartz (1990) has noted,

“First, the dichotomy leads us to overlook values that inherently serve both individual and collective interest (e.g. maturity values). Second, the dichotomy ignores values that foster the goals of collectivist other than the in-group (e.g. universal 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 and of collectivist values sometimes do not vary together and are sometimes not opposed” (p. 151).

Triandis (1993), whose work has employed the value types, recently conceded that all humans are both individualistic and collectivist. “Individualism and collectivism can coexist and simply emphasize a culture depending upon the situation” (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 in-group and out-group communication.

Also recommended to potential researchers in this area is to use Schwartz’s and Bilsky’s (1990) measure of Universal Values in Individualist-Collectivist setting for the evaluation of intercultural sensitivity. A study using that instrument has concluded that this scale as a measure of intercultural sensitivity has considerable potential, provided refinements to the individualism-collectivism typology are completed (Blue, Kapoor & Comadena, 1996). One refinement the investigation suggests may be provided by the inclusion of vertical and horizontal dimensions of individualism-collectivism in the study of diverse cultures. “By including the vertical and horizontal dimensions in our study of culture, researchers gain information on the way in which individuals and societies perceive and accept inequality between people” (Singelis, *et al.* 1995).

References

- Bhauk, D. P. S. & Brislin, R.
 1992 The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 413-36.
- Blue, J., Kapoor, S. & Comadena, M,
 1996 Using cultural values as a measure of intercultural sensitivity. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 6 (2), 77-94.
- Brislin, R., Cushner, K., Cherie, C. & Young, M.
Intercultural interactions: A practical guide. Beverly Hills, CA:Sage Publications.
- Church, A.T.
 1982 Sojourner adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 540-72.
- Gudykunst, 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: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.
- Hui, C. & Triandis, H.
 1986 Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 17, 225-48.
- Kang, J., Kapoor, S. & Wolfe, A.
 1995 The impact of television viewing on the values orientations of Indian students: An individualistic-collectivist approach. *Howard Journal of Communication*, 6 (3), 188-205.
- Kapoor, S. & Comadena, M. (
 1996 Intercultural sensitivity in individualist- collectivist settings. *World Communication Journal*, 25 (4), 169-75.
- Kapoor, S., Blue, J., & Wolfe, A.
 1995 Universal values structure and individualism-collectivism: A U.S. test. *Communication Research Reports*, 23, 112-23.
- Kealey, D.J.
 1989 A study of cross-cultural effectiveness: Theoretical issues, practical applications. *International Journal of Intercultural*

Relations, 13, 387-428.

Kealey, D. & Ruben, B.

1983 Cross cultural personnel selection: Criteria, issues, and methods. In D. Landis and R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook for Intercultural Training*. Vol. 1: Issues in theory and design. New York: Pergamon. pp. 155-75.

Schwartz, S.

1990 Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 21, 139-57.

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.

Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H.C., Bhawuk, D.P.S. & Gelfand, M.J.

1995 Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross Cultural Research*, 29 (3), 240-75.

Triandis, H.

1993 Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross Cultural Research*, 27, 155-80.

1990 Theoretical concepts that are applicable to the analysis of ethnocentrism. In R. Brislin (Ed.) *Applied Cross Cultural Psychology*, 9. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Triandis, H. & Waters, H.

Indo-Col measure used in race, culture and interpersonal conflict. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 437-55.

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., Bentancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J., Verman, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H. & DeMontmollin, B.

1986 The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across the 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.

Ward, C. & Searle, W.

1991 The impact of value discrepancies and cultural identity on psychological and socio-cultural adjustment of sojourners.

International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 209-25.

APPENDIX A
Behavioral Patterns *

1. When I disagree with a group, I would allow a conflict in the group to remain, rather than change my own stance on important issues.
- ** 2. I would offer my seat in a bus to my supervisor.
- * 3. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people.
- ** 4. I enjoy developing long-term relationships among the people with whom I work.
- ** 5. I am very modest when talking about my own accomplishment.
- * 6. When I give gifts to people whose cooperation I need in my work, I feel I am indulging in questionable behavior.
- * 7. If I want my subordinate to perform a task, I tell the person that my superiors want me to get that task done.
- ** 8. I prefer to give opinions that will help people save face rather than give a statement of the truth.
- * 9. I say "No" directly when I have to.
- ** 10. I define the other person's status by paying attention to name, gender, age and other demographic attributes.
- * 11. To increase sales, I would announce that the individual salesperson with the highest sales would be given the "Distinguished Salesperson" award.
- ** 12. I enjoy being emotionally close to the people with whom I work
- * 13. It is important to develop a network of people in my community who can help me out when I have tasks to complete.
- * 14. I enjoy feeling that I am looked upon as equal in worth to my superiors.
- ** 15. I have respect for the authority figures with which I interact.
- ** 16. If I want a person to perform a certain task I try to show how the task will benefit others in the person's group.

Note: * = Individualist
** = Collectivist

APPENDIX B
General Attitudes and Beliefs

- * 1. One should live one's life independently of others as much as possible.
 - ** 2. I would help, within my means, if a relative told me that he or she is in financial difficulty.
 - * 3. I would rather struggle through a personal problem by myself than discuss it with my friends.
 - ** 4. I like to live close to my good friends.
 - * 5. The most important thing in my life is to make myself happy.
 - ^ 6. It is important to me that I perform better than others on a task.
 - * 7. I tend to do my own things, and most people in my family do the same.
 - ** 8. Aging parents should live at home with their children.
 - * 9. What I look for in a job is a friendly group of co-workers.
 - * 10. Children should live at home with their parents until they get married.
 - ^ 11. One does better working alone than in a group.
 - * 12. Individuals should be judged on their own merits, not on the company they keep.
- * 13. When faced with a difficult personal problem, it is better to decide what to do yourself, rather than follow the advice of others.
 - ^ 14. It doesn't matter to me how my country is viewed in the eyes of other nations.
- ** 15. I enjoy meeting and talking to my neighbor's everyday.
 - ** 16. I can count on my relatives for help if I find myself in any kind of trouble.
 - * 17. What happens to me is my own doing.
 - * 18. If the group is slowing me down, it is better to leave it and work alone.
 - * 19. Even if the child won the Nobel prize, the parents should not feel honored in any way.
 - ^ 20. Children should not feel honored even if the father were highly praised and an award by a government official for his contribution and service to the community.
 - * 21. In most cases, to cooperate with someone whose ability is lower than oneself is not as desirable as doing the thing on one's own.

Note: * = Individualist item
** = Collectivist item
^ = Mixed item