

**TV and University and High School Students'
Value Preference – An Individualist – Collectivist Perspective**

Suraj Kapoor *
Illinois State University

Catherine Konsky
Illinois State University

Janet Blue
Illinois State University

Abstract

In re-evaluating the theory of universal value structure as developed by Schwartz and the individualism-collectivism dichotomy as proposed by Triandis and others, this study, using university and high school students in the United states, concluded that both concepts have acceptance in an intercultural setting. The majority of the value types proposed by Schwartz were found compatible by the American sample. The individualism-collectivism dichotomy finds a qualified support as American, on the whole, opts for individualist values. However, results reveal several anomalies, which need further investigation. This investigation also has found the importance of social and cultural structures in analyzing value preference.

Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987) theory of a universal psychological structure of human values has been tested in several cultures. However, the proponents of this theory admit themselves that theories such as theirs which "aspire to universality must be tested in numerous culturally diverse samples" (1987, 1). Our study, using data from the United States, an individualist culture, attempts to (1) test the universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's theory, (2) determine which values thought to be linked with particular values are compatible and which oppose, and (3) ascertain whether the value preference of American students follows one of two patterns specified by Triandis (1990) and others as individualist or collectivist.

Our study also attempts to examine selected social and cultural factors operating in the American society in order to determine if this account for differences in value preferences expressed in the population's studies. No single investigation is capable of determining the effect of every social and cultural

variable on the value preference of a given population. We have, therefore, focused on television, a significant cultural institution, and seek to determine whether and how it interacts with other variables such as age and gender to affect value preferences of American students.

This paper concentrates on three areas (1) the universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987) theory of a universal value structure, (2) the applicability of Triandis (1990) individualist-collectivist typology diverse cultures, and (3) the role of such cultural institutions as television in contributing to value priorities in the population studied. The ensuing discussion is aimed at providing a conceptual framework for the three areas.

Universality of Value Structure: The theory of a universal structure of human values was proposed by Schwartz and Bilsky in their studies (1987, 1990), with a revised version presented in a later study (Schwartz 1992). Their conceptual definition of value incorporates the five formal features of values, which are recurrently mentioned in literature. According to these features, values are (1) concepts or beliefs, (2) pertain to desirable end states or behaviors, (3) transcend specific situations, (4) guide selection or evaluation of behaviors and events, and (5) are ordered by relative importance.

Besides the formal features Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) proposed that primary content aspect of a value is the type of goal or motivational concern that it expresses. This, derived from three universal requirements ... needs of individuals as biological organism, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and survival and welfare needs of groups ... were eight motivational types or domains: pro-social, restrictive conformity, enjoyment, achievement, maturity, self-direction, security and power.

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 studied supported the view that individuals in seven countries experienced the first seven value types as distinct. Additional values presumed to measure power were included for one sample and emerged as distinct.

The theory also underlined a set of dynamic relations among the motivational types of values. The proponents of the theory posited that actions taken in the pursuit of each value type have psychological, practical, and social consequences that may be compatible or may conflict with the pursuit of other 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 discovered

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).

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. We will explicate each in turn:

1. Power: Schwartz views the central goal of power values as the attainment of social status and prestige, and the control or dominance over people and resources. Power values are grounded in status differentiation (Parsons, 1957) and dominance vs. subordination in interpersonal relations. The values represented in this type are: having social power, wealth, authority, social recognition and preserving one's public image.

2. Achievement: The primary goal of this value is identified by personal success by means of demonstrating competence according to prevailing social standards. Rokeach (1973) has cited achievement values. Values associated with achievement are ambition, being successful, capable, intelligent and being influential.

3. Hedonism: The defining goals of this value are derived from the experience of orgasmic needs, pleasures accounted with these needs and the satisfaction of these pleasures. Values identified with hedonism are pleasure and enjoyment.

4. Stimulation: The three goals of this value are excitement, novelty and a challenging life. Schwartz explains that stimulation values are derived from the presumed individual's need for variety so he or she will be able to maintain the optimal level of activation. Leading a varied life, having an exciting and daring life are values associated with stimulation.

5. Self-Direction: Independent thought and action has been identified by Schwartz as the defining goals. This type is derived from orgasmic needs of control and mastery (Bandura, 1977; Deci, 1975) and interaction requirements of autonomy and independence (Kohn & Schooler 1983). The values included in this type are: creativity, freedom, choosing one's own goals, curiosity and independence.

6. Benevolence: The motivational goal of benevolence, according to Schwartz, is preservation and enhancement of the welfare of the people with whom one has frequent personal contact. Values associated with this category are: helpfulness, responsibility, forgiving, honesty, loyalty, mature love and true friendship.

7. Tradition: Groups everywhere develop symbols and practices that represent their shared experience and fate. These eventually become sanctioned traditions and customs and are values by group members (Sumner, 1906). Traditional modes of behavior symbolizes group solidarity, expression of its unique work, and preemptively guarantees survival (Parsons, 1957). Traditions may take the form of religious rites, beliefs, and norms of behavior. Schwartz regards respect for, commitment to, and acceptance of the customs and ideas of one's culture or religion impose on the individual as the motivational goal. The values linked with this type are: respect for tradition, accepting one's portion in life and being devout, humble and moderate.

8. Conformity: The defining goal of this value type is restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms. Freud (1930), Kohn and Schooler (1983), and Parsons (1957) have all examined conformity. The values presented in this type are: obedience, self-discipline, politeness, cleanliness, the honoring of parents and elders and maintaining social order.

9. Universalism: Schwartz lists understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and nature as the motivational goal of universalism. Schwartz notes, in contrast with the narrow focus of the benevolence values, values representing universalism are: equality, unity with nature, wisdom, social justice, being broadminded, living in a world of beauty, a world at peace and living in a world in which the natural environment is protected.

10. Security: The motivational goal of this value type is the stability of one's self, of one's relationships and of the society in which one resides: feeling safe and in harmony with oneself and with one's surrounding society. Values represented in this type are: a sense of belonging, reciprocation of favors, attaining family security, attaining national security, social order, as well as feeling healthy and clean.

11. Spirituality: Philosophers, sociologists and theologians emphasize that customs and creeds endow life with meaning and coherence in the face of the seeming senselessness of everyday existence. Most religions supply answers to this apparent senselessness by referring to some supernatural being; while the humanism perspective locates sources of meaning in the natural world (Glock & Stark, 1965; Kaplan, 1961). Schwartz has clustered these concerns in a value type he calls spirituality. The values included in it are: achieving inner harmony, finding meaning in life, being detached and having a spiritual life.

As with Schwartz (1992), 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 all samples, including the American sample studied? (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 value 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).

Individualist-collectivist typology: If values are viewed as goals, then their attainment must serve the interests of the individual and/or of some collectively (Schwartz, 1992). Values that serve individual interests are postulated to be opposed to those that serve collective ones. This is the rationale behind the theory of individualism-collectivism, as developed by Triandis (1993) and others (see Hui & Triandis, 1986; Triandis, Leung, Villareal & Clark, 1985; Triandis, et. al., 1986, Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucas, 1988).

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), probing with more items and "with more refined focus on that specific construct," found four orthogonal factors that are related to collectivism-individualism: family integrity and interdependent representing aspects of collectivism, and self-reliance and separation from in-groups representing aspects of individualism.

Triandis *et. al* (1985) also identified personality attributes that correspond with both types of cultures stressing individualist and collectivist values. Corresponding to individualism across cultures is idiocentrism and corresponding to collectivism is allocentrism. Triandis *et al.* (1985) contended that this distinction invites discussion of allocentrism in individualist cultures and idiocentrism in collectivist ones. It seems that interdependency, sociability and idiocentrism best describe collectivism by self-reliance (Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990). Triandis et. al (1990) warn against oversimplification, however, cultures that stress individualist values can support allocentric ones, just as cultures that stress collectivist values can support idiocentric ones. Even within families in either culture, individual family members may prefer individualist values with respect to such matters as achievement in school or on the job and collectivist values with respect to such matters as environmental quality considered on a global scale.

In a detailed analysis of individualism and collectivism, Triandis *et al.* (1990) point out that these constructs can best be defined by means of several attributes. Collectivists pay much attention to a certain in-group such as the tribe, the work group, the family or the nation and behave differently toward members of such groups than toward members of out-groups. Individualists do not perceive a sharp distinction between in-groups and out-groups. In individualist cultures, conflicts between in-group goals and individual goals, personal goals have primacy over in-group goals resolve in favor of the latter. Whereas in collectivist cultures such conflicts tend to resolve in favor of in-group goals.

In collectivist cultures, behavior is governed largely by in-group norms, which are important determinants of social behavior. In individualistic cultures, individual likes and dislikes regulate behavior; attitudes are pivotal in such cultures. Hierarchy and harmony are important when defining attributes of collectivists; confrontation within the in-group is personal achievement, and interdependence within the in-group is emphasized in collectivist cultures. Personal fate, personal achievement, and independence from the in-group are stressed in the individualist cultures. Thus, collectivists tend to think of groups as the basic unit of analysis, while individualists tend to consider individuals as the basic unit of analysis.

Following Triandis's (1990) observation that exposure to modern mass media promotes a shift from collectivism to individualism, our study is designed to investigate what the effect of television viewing is on the value preferences of the population examined.

Several studies have found television to be a potent agent of socialization (see Jhally, 1987 & Comstick, 1980). DeFleur (1970) refers to Lazarsfeld and Morton's finding that the mass media operates conservatively and follow the prevailing public norms in matter such as tastes, thereby reinforcing the status quo. This is further supported by an experimental study by Sanders and Atwood (1979) which concluded that television, along with other avenues of communication, was capable of affecting value change, although their investigation did not discover any significant differences among the interpersonal, television and print groups in terms of the amount of value change induced.

DeFleur (1970) also alludes to the media's potential for creating values by stimulating new forms of behavior that ultimately receive widespread social approval. He posits a number of instances including young boys imitating Tarzan-like behaviors viewed on television, that suggest the media can create new cultural values. The changing of cultural values has not received widespread support from media researchers. Klapper (1970) for example, denies that the media have much power to convert values in well-established behavioral areas. Finally, DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1982) argued the media may have little ability to change the value structure of individuals, but rather they may be the presentation of information in conflict with existing values.

Method

A self-administered questionnaire was given in 1994 to 514 college students attending a large mid-western university and 525 high school students studying in the same area. The questionnaire was lengthy and contained items assessing a variety of opinions, knowledge, and media beliefs and habits. It began with value measures of 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 survey was conducted in classes over a period of one week. Instructors (professors) were provided complete instructions by the authors to answer any possible questions raised by the respondents. The university sample was 42% male and 58% female and the high school subjects were 48% male and 52% female. Average mean age for university students was 20.1 and for high school students was 15.8.

Respondents' value orientation were assessed using a 56 Lickert-type scale adapted from a series of value estimates developed by Schwartz (1992). 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 orientations: 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:

University Students

1. Individualism: Four indices measuring university students' individualistic value orientations toward Achievement, an index consisting of seven variable comprising "ambitious," "successful," "capable," "intelligent," "self-respect," "choosing one's own goals," and "independent" (alpha = .55, Eigenvalue 6.03, Total variance 20.2%); Power, an index consisting of five variables: "wealth," "social power," "authority," "social recognition," and "preserving one's own public image" (alpha = .53, Eigenvalue 2.1, Total variance 40%); Stimulation, an index consisting of four variables: "varied life," "daring life," "creativity" and "curious" (Alpha = .56, Eigenvalue 1.3, Total variance 47%); Hedonism, an index consisting of "pleasure," "enjoyment," "exciting life" and "freedom" (alpha = .54, Eigenvalue 1.0, Total variance 52%).

2. Collectivism: Three indices that measure the sample's collectivist orientation with respect to Benevolence, an index comprised of four variables: "helpful," "responsible," "forgiving" and "honest" (alpha = .55, Eigenvalue 4.07, Total variance 34%); Tradition, an index comprised of five variables: "true friendship," "mature love," "respect for tradition," "self-discipline" and "politeness" (alpha = .53, Eigenvalue 1.28, Total variance 44%); and Conformity, an index consisting of three variables: "moderate," "acceptance of one's position in life" and "obedience" (alpha = .58, Eigenvalue 1.6, Total variance 53%).

3. Mixed: Three indices that measure the sample's orientation toward value types that are blends of collectivist and individualist values. These mixed indices are Universalism, an index comprised of six variables: "equality," "social justice," "unity with nature," "world of beauty," "world peace" and "broadmindedness" (alpha = .53, Eigenvalue 3.7, Total variance 34%); Security I, an index comprising three variables: "health," "clean" and "family security" (alpha = .59, Eigenvalue 1.3, Total variance 45%); and Security II, an index comprising of two variables: "sense of belonging" and "social order" (alpha = .57, Eigenvalue 1.1, Total variance 55%).

No indices could be formulated for the spiritual value type.

High School Students

1. Individualism: Four indices measuring high school students' individualistic values orientations toward Achievement, an index consisting of six variables comprising "ambitious," "successful," "capable," "intelligent," "choosing one's own goals" and "independent" (alpha = .57, Eigenvalue 6.0, Total variance 28.6%); Power, an index consisting of five variables: "wealth," "social power," "authority," "social recognition" and "preserving one's own public image" (alpha = .55, Eigenvalue 2.35, Total variance 40%); Stimulation, an index consisting of four variables: "varied life," "daring life," "creativity" and "curious" (alpha = .58, Eigenvalue 1.2, Total variance 50%); Hedonism, an index consisting of "pleasure," "enjoyment," "exciting life" and "freedom" (alpha = .54, Eigenvalue 1.2, total variance 45%).

2. Collectivism: Three indices that measure the sample's collectivist orientation with respect to Benevolence, an index comprised of five variables: "responsible," "loyalty," "true friendship," "forgiving" and "honest" (alpha = .58, Eigenvalue 1.2, Total variance 47%); Tradition, an index comprised of eight variables: "accept one's portion in life," "devout," "respect for tradition," "honor parents," "obedience," "helpfulness" and "politeness" (alpha = .55, Eigenvalue 6.3, Total variance 39%); and Conformity, an index consisting of three variables: "mature love," "humble" and "self-discipline" (alpha = .58, Eigenvalue 1.0, Total variance 54%).

3. Mixed: Four indices that measure the sample's orientation toward value types that are blends of collectivist and individualistic values. These mixed indices are: Universalism I, an index comprised of four variables: "social justice," "unity with nature," "world of beauty" and "natural environments" (alpha = .55, Eigenvalue 5.1, Total variance 34%); Security I, an index comprising three variables: "health," "clean" and "family security" (alpha = .59, Eigenvalue 1.0, Total variance 50%); and Security II, an index comprising of four variables: "sense of belonging," "social justice," "reciprocation of favors" and "national security" (alpha = .57, Eigenvalue

1.28, Total variance 42%); and **Universalism II**, consisting of “equality,” “world at peace” and “broadmindedness” (alpha = .58, Eigenvalue 1.0, Total variance 57%).

No indices could be formulated for the spiritual value type. The independent variable in this study is the amount of television viewing among American 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 statistical analysis, the sample was partitioned into light (less than an hour daily), moderate (1 to 2 hours daily), to heavy (2 hours or more daily) television viewers; with continuous data used impartial correlation's.

Among numerous demographic and control variables, gender and race were also used as independent variables to analyze their impact on the sample's value orientation.

Results

University Students:

Means Comparison: Means and standard deviations were computed for the 11 indices. As shown in Table 1, the overall means of the individualist, collectivist, and mixed values reveals that American students do not overwhelmingly prefer one value type over another, even though individualist value type had a higher mean (5.05) than collectivist (5.0) and mixed (4.92). Similarly, the students in our sample do not have any perceptible preference among the individual value types within the three categories. There is no consistency in their selection of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction (all individualist values) or benevolence, tradition and conformity (all collectivist values) or universality and security (mixed values).

Table 1
Value Items by Mean Rating
(University Students)

Type*	Value	Means	S.D.
M	Family	6.0	1.2
M	Healthy	6.0	1.1
C	True Friendship	5.9	1.2
I	Freedom	5.9	1.2
I	Enjoyment	5.9	1.3
I	Self Respect	5.9	1.7
I	Choosing Goals	5.9	1.1
I	Successful	5.8	1.2
I	Intelligent	5.8	1.1

C	Honest	5.8	1.1
C	Responsible	5.7	1.1
I	Capable	5.7	1.1
C	Loyal	5.7	1.1
S	Meaning in Life	5.7	1.3
I	Independent	5.7	1.3
C	Mature Love	5.6	1.4
I	Ambitious	5.6	1.3
S	Inner Harmony	5.6	1.4
C	Honoring of One's Parents	5.5	1.4
M	Wise	5.4	1.3
M	Equality	5.4	1.4
C	Helpful	5.3	1.3
C	Forgiving	5.3	1.3
M	Broadmindedness	5.2	1.3
M	Sense of Belonging	5.2	1.3
I	An Exciting Life	5.1	1.4
M	World at Peace	5.1	1.4
C	Politeness	5.1	1.3
C	Self Discipline	5.1	1.3
M	Social Justice	5.0	1.4
I	Curious	5.0	1.4
I	Pleasure	5.0	1.4
I	Creativity	5.0	1.4
M	Clean	5.0	1.7
I	A Varied Life	4.9	1.4
I	Influential	4.7	1.5
C	Obedience	4.7	1.5
I	Social Recognition	4.7	1.4
S	Spiritual Life	4.5	1.7
C	Devout	4.5	1.9
M	Reciprocation of Favors	4.5	1.5
M	Social Order	4.5	1.5
C	Humble	4.5	1.5
M	World of Beauty	4.5	1.5
C	Accepting One's Portion in Life	4.5	1.7
M	National Security	4.4	1.6
I	Preserving One's Public Image	4.4	1.7
I	A Boring Life	4.4	1.7
I	Wealth	4.4	1.6

M	Protection of the Environment	4.2	1.6
C	Respect for Tradition	4.2	1.6
I	Authority	4.1	1.6
M	Unity with Nature	3.9	1.6
C	Moderate	3.7	1.6
S	Detachment	3.4	1.6
I	Social Power	3.1	1.7

Number of Cases = 514

Value Type

- * S: Spirituality
 C: Collectivist
 I: Individualist
 M: Mixed

Value Items Rating: Even though the overall mean comparison between individualist, collectivist and mixed values indicates that American students do not have a marked preference among collectivist, mixed and individualist value types, the same conclusion cannot be drawn with respect to the full complement of the 56 values investigated. The means for the values examined reveal a clear discernible pattern in Americans' ranking of most to least preferred individualist, collectivist, mixed and spiritual values. Among the top 10 preferred values, eight are individualist or mixed. Similarly, among the 10 least preferred, the majority of them are collectivist, mixed or spiritual.

Table 2
 Summary of the Means & Standard Deviation of Value Types
 (University Students)

	Number of Values In Index	Mean	S.D.
Individualist Values			
Overall	20	5.05	.76
<u>Factors:</u>			
Power	(5)	4.13	1.16
Achievement	(7)	5.77	.00
Hedonism	(4)	5.49	.94
Stimulation	(4)	4.82	1.03

Collectivist Values

Overall	12	5.00	.80
<u>Factors:</u>			
Benevolence	(4)	5.52	.90
Tradition	(5)	4.31	1.19
Conformity	(3)	5.18	.94

Mixed Values

Overall	11	5.13	.82
<u>Factors:</u>			
Universality	(6)	4.86	1.02
Security I	(3)	5.65	.98
Security II	(2)	4.88	1.24

Spiritual

One Factor	1	5.26	1.10
------------	---	------	------

Analysis of Variance: Concerning individualism, collectivism, mixed and spiritual dimension, television exposure does not appear to effect a statistically significant difference in value preference, as heavy viewers of television, judging by the higher means, seem to prefer individualist, collectivist and mixed value types simultaneously when compared with light and medium viewers.

Table 3
Analysis of Variance: Variable Value Type by Race
(University Students)

Individualism					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	408	5.0311	.7876	14.9951	.0001
2 (Others)	92	5.3705	.6180		

Total	500	5.0935	.7700
-------	-----	--------	-------

Collectivism

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	408	4.9533	.8370	8.8103	.0031
2 (Others)	92	5.2327	.7135		
Total	500	5.0047	.8222		

Mixed

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	408	4.9435	.7914	22.8394	.0000
2 (Others)	92	5.3758	.7491		
Total	500	5.0230	.8008		

Spiritual

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	408	4.6544	.9444	49.2150	.0000
2 (Others)	92	5.4212	.9586		
Total	500	4.7955	.9917		

Although our study found statistically significant differences among whites and non-whites in value preference, the results are extremely inconsistent. The responses indicated that non-whites are significantly more individualistic than whites. However, the data also point out that they (non-whites) prefer collectivist and mixed value types as well when compared with the whites.

Finally, our study finds that there are statistically significant and consistent differences among males and females in their preference of the value types. Female

respondents in our sample are far less individualistic than males and conversely opt for more collectivist and mixed value types.

Table 5
Analysis of Variance by Value Type and Sex
(University Students)

Individualism					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Male)	214	5.1755	.7484	3.9081	.0486
2 (Female)	290	5.0388	.7742		
Total	504		5.0969		.7698
Collectivism					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Male)	214	4.8931	.8540	6.5894	.0105
2 (Female)	290	5.0823	.7904		
Total	504	5.0020	.8225		
Mixed					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Male)	214	4.9129	.8791	7.0180	.0083
2 (Female)	290	5.1022	.7231		
Total	504		5.0218		.7978
Spiritual					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.

1 (Male)	214	4.6215	1.0046	11.0038	.0010
2 (Female)	290	4.9181	.9830		
Total	504	4.7922	1.0020		

High School Students:

Means Comparison: Means and standard deviations were computed for the 11 indices. As showing Table 6, the overall means of the individualist, collectivist and mixed values reveal that American students do not overwhelmingly prefer one value type over another, even though individualist value type had a higher mean (4.99_ than collectivist (4.98) and mixed (4.92). Similarly, the students in our sample do not have any perceptible preference among the individual value types within the three categories. There is no consistency in their selection of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction (all individualist values) or benevolence, tradition and conformity (all collectivist values) or universality and security (mixed values).

Table 6
Value Items by Mean Rating
(High School Students)

Type*	Value	Means	S.D.
M	Family	5.7	1.3
M	Healthy	5.7	1.3
C	True Friendship	6.0	1.2
I	Freedom	6.0	1.2
I	Enjoyment	5.8	1.4
I	Self Respect	5.6	1.3
I	Choosing Goals	5.6	1.3
I	Successful	5.6	1.3
I	Intelligent	5.5	1.3
C	Honest	5.7	1.3
C	Responsible	5.6	1.3
I	Capable	5.3	1.3
C	Loyal	5.7	1.2
S	Meaning in Life	5.4	1.4
I	Independent	5.2	1.4
C	Mature Love	5.2	1.5
I	Ambitious	5.4	1.3

S	Inner Harmony	5.0	1.5
C	Honoring of One's Parents	5.1	1.5
M	Wise	5.2	1.4
M	Equality	5.3	1.5
C	Helpful	5.2	1.4
C	Forgiving	5.4	1.3
M	Broadmindedness	5.1	1.4
M	Sense of Belonging	5.5	1.3
I	An Exciting Life	5.2	1.4
M	World at Peace	5.2	1.6
C	Politeness	5.1	1.4
C	Self Discipline	5.0	1.4
M	Social Justice	4.9	1.5
I	Curious	4.9	1.4
I	Pleasure	4.8	1.4
I	Creativity	4.9	1.5
M	Clean	4.9	1.7
I	A Varied Life	4.8	1.5
I	Influential	4.7	1.5
C	Obedience	4.8	1.4
I	Social Recognition	4.6	1.5
S	Spiritual Life	4.4	1.6
C	Devout	4.7	1.7
M	Reciprocation of Favors	4.3	1.5
M	Social Order	4.5	1.5
C	Humble	4.5	1.4
M	World of Beauty	4.5	1.6
C	Accepting One's Portion in Life	4.7	1.6
M	National Security	4.4	1.7
I	Preserving One's Public Image	4.4	1.6
I	A Boring Life	4.4	1.7
I	Wealth	4.1	1.6
M	Protection of the Environment	4.3	1.7
C	Respect for Tradition	4.3	1.6
I	Authority	4.1	1.6
M	Unity with Nature	3.8	1.7
C	Moderate	3.7	1.5
S	Detachment	3.5	1.5
I	Social Power	2.9	1.6

Number of Cases = 525

Value Type

- * S: Spirituality
 C: Collectivist
 I: Individualist
 M: Mixed

Value Items Rating: Even though the overall mean comparison between individualist, collectivist and mixed values indicates that high school students do not have a marked preference among collectivist, mixed and individualist value types, the same conclusion cannot be drawn with respect to the full complement of the 56 values investigated. The means of the values examined reveal a clear discernible pattern in Americans' ranking of most to least preferred individualist, collectivist, mixed and spiritual values. Among the top 10 preferred values, seven are individualist or mixed. Similarly, among the 110 least preferred, the majority of them are collectivist, mixed or spiritual.

Table 7
 Summary of the Means & Standard Deviation of Value Types
 (High School Students)

	Number of Values In Index	Mean	S.D.
Individualist Values			
Overall	19	4.99	
.78			
<u>Factors:</u>			
Power	(5)	4.13	1.10
Achievement	(4)	5.31	
.93			
Hedonism	(2)	5.31	1.14
Stimulation	(3)	4.98	1.17
Self Direction	(5)	5.30	.90
Collectivist Values			
Overall	16	4.98	
.87			
<u>Factors:</u>			

Benevolence	(7)	5.53	.92
Tradition	(5)	4.39	1.06
Conformity	(4)	5.02	
.97			
Mixed Values			
Overall	14	4.92	
.87			
<u>Factors:</u>			
Universality	(7)	4.77	1.01
Security	(7)	5.07	
.93			
Spiritual			
One Factor	4	4.57	.92

Analysis of Variance: Concerning individualism, collectivism, mixed and spiritual dimensions, television exposure does not appear to effect a statistically significant difference in value preference, as heavy viewers of television, judging by the higher means, seem to prefer individualist, collectivist and mixed value types simultaneously when compared with light and medium viewers. In this respect, university and high school student shave considerable similarities.

Table 8
Analysis of Variance by TV Exposure & Value Type
(University Students)

Individualism					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Low)	68	4.9615	.7765	.273	.761
2 (Medium)	227	4.9663	.7338		
3 (Heavy)	330	5.0157	.8211		
Total	525				
Collectivism					
			Standard	F	F

Group	Count	Mean	Deviation	Ratio	Prob.
1 (Low)	68	4.9673	.9251	.283	.754
2 (Medium)	227	5.0166	.8187		
3 (Heavy)	330	4.9568	.9060		
Total	525				

Mixed

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Low)	68	4.84462	.8995	.487	.615
2 (Medium)	227	4.9584	.8625		
3 (Heavy)	330	4.9066	.8805		
Total	525				

Spiritual

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Low)	68	4.5647	.9513	.007	.993
2 (Medium)	227	4.5674	.9051		
3 (Heavy)	330	4.5765	.9298		
Total	525				

Although our study found statistically significant differences among high school whites and non-whites in value preference, the results are extremely inconsistent. The responses indicated that like the university sample, the high school non-whites are significantly more individualistic than whites. However the data also points out that they (non-whites) prefer collectivist and mixed value types as well when compared with the whites.

Table 9
Analysis of Variance: Variable Value Type by Race
(High School Students)

Individualism

Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	475	4.9619	.7868	5.377	.021
2 (Others)	50	5.2288	.6406		
Total	525				
Collectivism					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	475	4.9693	.8736	1.422	.234
2 (Others)	50	5.1236	.8378		
Total	500				
Mixed					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	475	4.9083	.8717	1.079	.300
2 (Others)	50	5.0433	.8989		
Total	500				
Spiritual					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (White)	475	4.5562	.9162	1.297	.255
2(Others)	50	4.7120	.9563		
Total	525				

Finally, our study finds that there are statistically significant and consistent differences among males and females in their preference of the value types. Female respondents in our sample are far less individualistic than males and conversely opt for more collectivist and mixed value types. Here again, university and high school students' responses correspond.

Table 10
Analysis of Variance by Value Type and Sex
(High School Students)

Individualism					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Male)	250	5.0081	.8517	.3412	.5594
2 (Female)	275	4.9684	.7044		
Total	525				
Collectivism					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Male)	250	4.8223	.9557	16.9784	.0000
2 (Female)	275	5.1311	.7577		
Total	525				
Mixed					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Male)	250	4.7625	.9840	16.1754	.0001
2 (Female)	275	5.0655	.7338		
Total	525				
Spiritual					
Group	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F Ratio	F Prob.
1 (Male)	250	4.5152	.9710	1.7601	.1852
2 (Female)	275	4.6218	.8703		
Total	525				

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 lined with particular value types are joined together by a sample of American University and American High School students, (3) to ascertain whether the value preferences of the two sampled conformed to one of the two patterns specified by Triandis (1990) and others as individualistic or collectivist, and (4) to assess the effects of such social variables as age and such cultural ones as television consumption on the values preferences of the population studied.

Our study found statistically significant correlations among individualistic, collectivist and mixed value types. In all, 43 out of 56 values in the university students sample and 47 out of 56 in the high school sample are joined together within the collectivist, individualist, and mixed value types Schwartz (1992) specifies. In both samples, only one individualist value was not accepted. The remaining rejected values were all either collectivist or mixed. Thus, the findings offer support for the salience of

all of Schwartz's (1992) individualistic, collectivistic and mixed value types with respect to the population studied. Indeed, the findings lend support to the claims of universal values structure theory that all of the values it links with the Hedonism, Stimulation and Benevolence value types are so lined. If the four spiritual values which were rejected by the subjects in Schwartz's (1992) study as well as in this one were not counted, more than 80 percent in both samples were joined together within the value types Schwartz (1992) specifies. Thus the findings of this study offer considerable, though not unqualified, support for the universal value structure theory.

Both university and high school American students surveyed for this study prefer individualist and mixed value types over the collectivist type as indicated by the relatively higher means the first two garnered relative to the third. Results reveal enough anomalies, however, so as to render any clear-cut pattern invisible. In fact, this study offers very limited evidence to validate the categorization of the United States as an individualist culture (see Hofstede, 1980 and Triandis et. al. 1990).

Perhaps the most 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 in expressed value preferences, even though television exposure does not appear to be a significant contributor to differences in value preferences as heavy, medium and low television viewers do not seem to have any priority in selecting individualist, collectivist or mixed value types. The independent variable sex, which had a relatively balanced representation of both males and females, accounts for a consistent finding pointing to females being a lot less individualistic in their value preference than males.

As far as television viewing by American students not contributing to differences in their values preference, it is very intriguing to note that this finding is in contrast to the results of a similar study using the same instrument involving Indian students (Kang, Kapoor, & Wolfe, 1995). In that study it was found that heavy television viewing contributed to a preference for individualist values. Further investigation is needed to explain why television does not perpetuate individualist values in a primarily individualist country like the United States does so in a limited way in a primarily collectivist country like India. Is it possible that American 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?

Finally, the findings of our study offer a strong endorsement for the universal structure of human values, including the value types. However, our research provides a very limited support for labeling any country as individualist or collectivist, based primarily on the people's value preference. Both samples in our study, even though slightly individualistic in their value preference, seem to embrace collectivist and mixed values with some, if not equal, intensity.

More studies are needed involving inhabitants of different cultures before the theory of individualism-collectivism as espoused by Harry Triandis and others acquires the status of universality.

References

Bandura, A.

1977 Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-2.
Comstock, G.

1980 *The spiritual life of children*.
Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Deci, E. L.

1975 *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.
DeFleur, M. & Ball-Rokeach, S.

1982 *Theories of mass communication*. New York: Longman.
DeFleur, M.

1970 *Theories of mass*

- communication*. New York: Mckay.
 Freud, S. 1930 *Civilization and its discontents*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Glock, G.Y. & Stark, R. 1965 *Religion and society in tension*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Hofstede, G. 1980 *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hui, C. H. & Triandis, H. C. 1986 Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 225-48.
- 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 individualistic-collectivist approach. *Howard Journal of Communication*. 6 (3), 188-205.
- Kaplan, A. 1961 *The new world of philosophy*. New York: Random House.
- Klapper, J. 1970 *The effects of mass communication*. New York: Free Press.
- Kohn, M. L. & Schooler, C. 1983 *Work and personality*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Parsons, T. 1957 *The social systems*. New York: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. 1973 *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Sanders, R., & Atwood, E. 1979 Value change initiated in the mass media. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values*,

- individual and social*. New York: Free Press.
- Schwartz, S.
 1992 Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical advances in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, 25, 1-66.
- Schwartz, S. H. & 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.
- 1987 Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-62.
- Sumner, W. G.
 1906 *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn.
- Triandis, H. C.
 1993 Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndrome. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 27, 155-80.
- 1990 Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H.
 1990 Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (5), 1006-20.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N.
 1988 Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-in-group relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C. H., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, M., & deMontmollin, G.,
 1986 The measurement of etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 257-67.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M., & Clark, F.L.
 Allocentric vs. idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 395-415.

