

Individualist-Collectivist Values: American, Indian and Japanese Cross-Cultural Study

Catherine Konsky
Illinois State University

Mariko Eguchi
Kanto Gakuin Women's College

Janet Blue
Illinois State University

Suraj Kapoor
Illinois State University

Abstract

The current study investigates the universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's theory pertaining to value types and ascertains whether the value preferences of American, Indian and Japanese students adhere to Triandis individualist-collectivist value types. The current study employs Schwartz and Bilsky's 56-value scale to obtain a measure of preference for traditionally individualistic, collectivist and mixed value types.

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 that theories such as theirs which "aspire to universality... must be tested in numerous culturally diverse samples" (1990, p. 878). Our study, using data from the United States, an individualistic culture, and from India and Japan, collectivist cultures, attempts to test the universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's theory, to verify empirically the conceptual value linkages proposed in the Schwartz and Bilsky study, and to ascertain whether the value preferences of American, Indian and Japanese students follow the individualist-collectivist distinction proposed by Triandis (1990). The ensuing discussion is aimed at providing a conceptual framework for the empirical investigation.

Universality of Value Structure: The theory of a universal structure of human values was proposed by Schwartz and Bilsky in their earlier studies (1987; 1990), with a revised version presented in a recent study (Schwartz, 1992). Their

conceptual definition of value incorporates the five formal features of values that are recurrently mentioned in the literature. According to these features, “values (1) are 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” (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, p. 551).

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

The theory also underlined a set of dynamic relations among the motivational types of values. The proponents of the theory posited those 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 surveyed. The scholars 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).

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-social, and security). The modified version contained 11 value types (three more than the original eight) [Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987; 1990]. They are power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity, universalism, security, and spirituality. The authors explicate each in turn.

1. Power: Schwartz (1988) views the central goal of power values as the attainment of social status and prestige, as well as the control or dominance over people and resources. Power values are grounded in status differentiation and dominance versus 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 type is identified by personal success through demonstrating competence according to prevailing social

standards. Values associated with achievement are ambition, being successful, capable, intelligent, and being influential.

3. Hedonism: This value type is derived from the experience of pleasure and focuses on the satisfaction of these pleasures. Values identified with hedonism are pleasure and enjoyment.

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

5. Self-Direction: Schwartz has identified independent thought and action as the defining goals. This type is derived from needs of control and mastery and interaction requirements of autonomy and independence. Values included in this type are: creativity, freedom, choosing one's own goals, curiosity, and independence.

6. Benevolence: For Schwartz the motivational goal of benevolence is preserving and improving the welfare of the people with whom one has regular personal contact. Values associated with this type are: helpfulness, responsibility, forgiving, honesty, loyalty, mature love and true friendship.

7. Tradition: Groups develop symbols and practices based on their shared experience. These become the traditions and customs valued by group members. Traditional modes of behavior reflect group unity, expression of its own work, and preemptively guarantee its survival. Traditions may take the form of religious rites, beliefs, or norms of behavior. Schwartz regards respect for, commitment to, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that one's culture or religion imposes on the individual as the motivational goal. The values linked with this type are: respect for tradition, accepting one's portion in life, as well as being devout, humble, and moderate.

8. Conformity: The defining goal of this value type is restraint of behaviors, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or to harm others, as well as to violate social expectations. The values presented in this type are: obedience, self-discipline, politeness, cleanliness, the honoring of parents and elders and maintaining societal order.

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

10. Security: The motivational goal of this value type is stability of one's self, one's relationships, and of the society in which one resides. Values represented in this type are: a sense of belonging, reciprocation of favors, attaining family security, attaining national security, and social order.

11. Spirituality: Philosophers, sociologists, and theologians contend that customs and creeds provide life with meaning and a sense of coherence. The values included in it are: achieving inner harmony, finding meaning in life, being detached, and having a spiritual life.

Table 1
Value Types and Value Traits

<u>Value Type</u>	<u>Culture</u>	<u>Value Trait</u>
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, Broadmindedness, Protection of Natural Environment
Security	Mixed	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.

Following Schwartz's (1992) lead, this study examines three fundamental questions which address the values linked with the 11 motivational value types: (1) Are all of the 11 value types represented in each of the three samples? (2) Are specific values linked with specific value types in the culture of the sample studied? and (3) Do any such linkages reinforce or challenge the putative universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987, 1990) universal values structure theory?

Individualist-collectivist typology

If values are viewed as goals, then their attainment must serve the interests of the individual (Schwartz 1992). Values that serve individual interests are postulated to be opposed to those that serve collective values. The rationale behind the theory of individualism-collectivism has been 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), after studying responses from subjects in 66 countries, identified one factor he labeled collectivism-individualism. Triandis *et al.* (1986, p. 261) "probing with more items and with a more refined focus on that specific construct, found four orthogonal factors that are related to collectivism-individualism: family, integrity and interdependence, which represent aspects of collectivism, and self-reliance and separation from in-groups which represent 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. However, Triandis further contended this analysis of the distinction should include discussion of allocentrism in individualist cultures and idiocentrism in collectivist cultures because elements of both types co-exist in a given culture. Just to what extent remains an empirical question. Collectivism is best described by family integrity and individualism by emotional detachment; interdependence and sociability best describe allocentrism while idiocentrism best describes self-reliance (Triandis, McCuskar and Hui, 1990). However, Triandis *et al.* (1990) warn against oversimplification insofar as 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 individualistic 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.

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 considerable attention to certain in-groups 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. In contrast, individualists do not perceive a sharp distinction between in-groups and out-groups. In individualist cultures if conflicts between in-groups and individual goals occur, personal goals have primacy over the in-group goals. Whereas, in collectivist cultures such conflicts tend to be resolved in favor of in-group goals as opposed to individual goals.

In collectivist cultures, behavior is governed largely by in-group norms that are important determinants of social behavior. In individualist cultures individual likes and dislikes regulate behavior. Hierarchy and harmony are important when defining attributes of collectivist cultures. Confrontation and personal achievement within the in-groups are emphasized in individualist cultures. Interdependence within the in-group is emphasized in collectivist cultures, but personal fate, personal achievement and interdependence 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 consider individuals as the basic unit of analysis.

Method

The instrument employed to survey the value preference of the three populations surveyed combined the values specified by Rokeach (1973) with 20 others identified by Schwartz (1992).

A self-administered questionnaire was given in 1996 and 1997 to college students attending universities in the United States, India and Japan. The questionnaire was lengthy and began with value measures of individualism and collectivism from cross-cultural perspectives. 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 respondents.

Results

Respondents' value orientations were assessed using a 56 item Likert-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 orientation: five indices of the "individualism" dimension, four indices of the "collectivism" dimension, and two indices of the "mixed" 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 yielded Cronbach's alphas of at least .53 (and usually higher). The dimensions tapped by the indices are as follows:

American Study

1. Individualism: Five indices measuring students' individualistic value orientations were identified: power, an index consisting of three variables, "Social Power," "Wealth," and "Authority" (Alpha = .56, Eigenvalue 1.72 and Total Variance 56.1%); achievement, an index consisting of three variables, "Capable," "Intelligent," and "Successful" (Alpha = .63, Eigenvalue 1.73 and Total Variance 58%); hedonism, an index consisting of two variables, "Pleasure" and "Enjoying Life" (Alpha = .54, Eigenvalue 1.47 and Total Variance 61%); stimulation, an index consisting of three variables, "Exciting Life," "Varied Life," and "Daring Life" (Alpha = .57, Eigenvalue 1.73 and Total Variance 58%); and self-direction, an index consisting of three variables, "Self-Respect," "Creativity," and "Individual Goals" (Alpha = .53, Eigenvalue 1.62 and Total Variance 54.7%).

2. Collectivism: Four indices measuring students' collectivist value orientation were identified: pro-social benevolence, an index consisting of three variables, "Mature Love," "True Friendship," and "Loyalty" (Alpha = .53, Eigenvalue 1.56 and Total Variance 54%); personal benevolence, an index consisting of four variables, "Honest," "Helpful," "Responsibility," and "Forgiveness" (Alpha = .63, Eigenvalue 1.97 and Total Variance 55%); tradition, an index consisting of three variables, "Respect for tradition," "Acceptance in life," and "Devout" (Alpha = .54, Eigenvalue 1.47 and Total Variance 55%) and conformity, an index consisting of three variables, "Polite," "Self-Discipline," and "Obedient" (Alpha = .57, Eigenvalue 1.81 and Total Variance 54%).

3. Mixed: Two indices measuring students' value orientation were identified: security, an index consisting of four variables, "Belonging," "National Security," "Family Security," and "Health" (Alpha = .59, Eigenvalue 1.72 and Total Variance 54%); and universality, an index consisting of five variables, "World at Peace," "Unity with Nature," "World of Beauty," "Social Justice," and "Protecting the Environment," (Alpha = .68, Eigenvalue 2.12 and Total Variance 61%).

Indian Study

1. Individualism: Five indices measuring student's individualistic value orientations were identified: power, an index consisting of three variables, of "Social Power," "Wealth," and "Authority" (Alpha = .55, Eigenvalue 1.60 and Total Variance 54%); achievement, an index consisting of three variables, "Capable," "Intelligent," and "Successful" (Alpha = .68, Eigenvalue 1.83 and Total Variance 61%); hedonism, an index consisting of two variables, "Pleasure" and "Enjoying Life" (Alpha = .52, Eigenvalue and Total Variance 66%); stimulation, an index consisting of three variables, "Exciting Life," "Varied Life," and "Daring Life" (Alpha = .62, Eigenvalue 1.67 and Total

Variance 56%); and self-direction, three variables consisting of “Self-respect,” “Creativity,” and “Individual Goals” (Alpha = .55, Eigenvalue 1.59 and Total Variance 52.8%).

2. Collectivism: Four indices measuring student's collectivist value orientation were identified: pro-social benevolence, an index consisting of three variables, “Mature Love,” “True Friendship,” and “Loyalty” (Alpha = .51, Eigenvalue 1.45 and Total Variance 2%); personal benevolence, an index consisting of four variables, “Honest,” “Helpful,” “Responsibility,” and “Forgiveness” (Alpha = .70, Eigenvalue 2.10 and Total Variance 53%); tradition, an index consisting of three variables, “Respect for tradition,” “Acceptance in life,” and “Devout” (Alpha = .51, Eigenvalue 1.50 and Total Variance 52%), and conformity, an index consisting of three variables, “Polite,” “Self-discipline,” and “Obedient,” (Alpha = .61, Eigenvalue 1.71 and Total Variance 57%).

3. Mixed: Two indices measuring students' value orientation were identified: security, an index consisting of four variables, “Belonging,” “National Security,” “Family Security,” and “Health” (Alpha = .61, Eigenvalue 1.85 and Total Variance 52%), universality, an index consisting of five variables: “World at Peace,” “Unity with Nature,” “World of Beauty,” “Social Justice,” and “Protecting the Environment” (Alpha = .77, Eigenvalue 2.63 and Total Variance 56%). No indices were identified for the spirituality value orientation.

Japanese Study

1. Individualism: Six indices measuring students' individualistic value orientations were identified: achievement, an index consisting of three individualistic variables, “Ambitious,” “Capable,” and “Successful” (Alpha = .65, Eigenvalue 4.09 and Total variance of 7.44%); power, an index consisting of two variables, “Social Power,” and “Social Recognition” (Alpha = .69, Eigenvalue 2.94 and Total variance of 5.34%); stimulation, an index consisting of two variables, “Exciting Life,” and “Daring Life” (Alpha =.56, Eigenvalue 2.46 and Total variance of 4.47%); and the final factor which consisted of one variable from three different individualistic indices: “Pleasure” a hedonistic index, “Freedom” a self-direction index and finally, “Wealth” a power index, (Alpha= .57, Eigenvalue 2.38 and Total variance of 4.33%).

2. Collectivism: For collectivism, the factor analysis did not indicate any clear-cut distinctions for value types as with the American and Indian samples. Four indices measuring students' collectivist value orientation were identified. Index 1 consisted of two collectivist variables, “Social Order” from the conformity value type, “Respect for Tradition” from the tradition value type, one individualistic

variable, “Social Recognition” from the power value type, and one variable, “Wisdom” from universalism, a mixed value type (Alpha = .69, Eigenvalue 3.10 and Total Variance 5.63%). Index 2 consisted of two collectivist variables, “Mature Love” from the benevolence value type and “Self-Discipline” from the conformity value type (Alpha = .29, Eigenvalue 2.25 and Total Variance 4.09%). Index 3 consisted of two collectivist variables, “Moderate” from the tradition value type and “Loyal” from the benevolence value type (No Alpha was determined, Eigenvalue 2.25 and Total Variance 4.08%). Index 4 contained one collectivist variable, “Devout” from the tradition value type (no Alpha was determined, Eigenvalue 1.83 and Total Variance 3.33%).

3. Mixed: Two indices were identified for this category. One factor contained two indices: security, consisting of three variables, “World at peace,” “Family security,” and “Protect the environment” and universalism, an index consisting of two variables, “Unity with nature,” and “social justice” (Alpha = .71, Eigenvalue 3.16 and a Total variance of 5.75%).

American Study

Mean Comparisons: Means and standard deviations were computed for the 11 indices. As shown in Table 2, [see next page] 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 the individualist value types had a higher mean (4.85) than collectivist (4.83) and mixed (4.82) value types. No pattern emerged in respondents’ for selection of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction (all individualist values) or pro-social, benevolence, tradition, and conformity (all collectivist values) or universality and security (mixed values).

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

Table 2
Summary of Means

	Number of Values		#	Indian	#	Japanese
	In Index	American				
Individualist Values						
Overall:	14	4.85	14	4.05		4.80
Factors:						
Power	3	3.65	3	3.76	3	3.94
Achievement	3	5.15	3	5.60	3	4.53
Hedonism	2	5.42	2	4.60		
Stimulation	3	4.65	3	4.79		
Self-direct	3	5.40	3	5.31		
Collectivist Values						
Overall:	13	4.83	13	5.23		
Factors:						
Pro-social Benevolence	3	5.53	3	5.18		
Personal Benevolence	4	5.16	4	5.03		
Tradition	3	5.16	3	5.36	1	3.12
Conformity	3	4.60	3	5.36	2	3.83
Mixed Values						
Overall:	9	4.82	9	5.22		
Factors:						
Universality	5	4.39	5	5.15		
Security	4	5.25	4	5.29	3	5.02

Indian Study:

Mean comparisons: Means and standard deviations were computed for the 11 indices. As shown in Table 2, the overall means of the individualist, collectivist, and mixed value types reveal that the Indian students prefer collectivist value types (Mean=5.30) and mixed value types (Mean=5.22) over individualist (Mean=4.05).

Similarly, the students surveyed prefer collectivist type values such as benevolence, tradition and conformity (each of which has a mean greater or equal to 5.0) over individualist value types such as power, hedonism and stimulation (each of which has a mean less than 5.0). Indian students do not disfavor all of the individualist value types.

However, the value type of achievement that may be categorized as

individualistic boasts the highest mean (5.60) of all the value types studied. This may have more to do with the ambiguous nature of what achievement can mean than with any major value change taking place in such urban areas of India such as Delhi. If the achievement type were linked with such traditionally western associations as academic and job performance. A dualistic view of individuals and cultures would not render this finding surprising. Triandis *et al.*, (1985) remind us that idiocentric values, such as those comprising the achievement type, can thrive in collectivist cultures.

Value-Item Rating: Even though the overall mean comparison between individualistic and collectivist and mixed value types indicates that Indian students prefer collectivist and mixed types over individualistic ones, the same conclusion cannot be drawn with respect to the full complement of the 56 values investigated. The means of the values examined reveal no clear pattern in Indian students' ranking of most to least preferred values. Among the top ten preferred values, three are collectivist; five are individualistic; one is mixed; and, one is spiritual. Similarly, among the ten least preferred three are individualistic; three are collectivist; three are spiritual; and, one is mixed. Follow-up studies are needed in order to specify those conditions in certain collectivist cultures such as India that prompt the preference for idiocentric values such as to be "successful." Such studies need to be complemented by ones that specify the conditions in individualistic cultures that prompt the preference for allocentric values.

Japanese Study

Mean comparisons: As with the American and Indian study, the means and standard deviations were computed for the 11 indices. As shown in Table 2, the overall means of the individualistic, collectivist, and mixed value types reveal that the sample of Japanese students prefer mixed value types (mean = 5.02) and individualist (mean 4.80) over collectivist value types (mean = 3.96). However, the students surveyed prefer individualistic type values such as hedonism and self-direction and a mixed type value, security (each of which has a mean equal to or greater than 5.0) over all of the collectivist value types such as benevolence tradition and conformity (each of which has a mean less than 5.0).

Value-Item Rating: Although the Japanese students' overall mean comparisons between individualist, collectivist, and mixed values indicate that they prefer mixed value types slightly more, the same conclusion cannot be drawn with respect to the full complement of the 56 values. Among the top ten preferred values, five were individualistic. However, among the ten least preferred, the majority, six values, were collectivist.

Discussion

Our study found statistically significant correlations among individualist, collectivist and mixed values in American, Indian and Japanese populations. Several items within each value type, however, were found incompatible. Out of a total of two values that could be categorized as individualist, Americans, Indians, and Japanese found 14 to be compatible with one another while eight were rejected. Among the 15 values that could be categorized as collectivist, our sample found 13 to be compatible with one another, while two were not. Nine out of 15 values comprising the mixed value type were found compatible with one another. None of the four values of the spiritual type were found compatible with one another. In all, 35 out of 56 values were found compatible within the collectivist, individualist, and mixed value types. If the four spiritual values, which were rejected by the subjects in Schwartz's (1992) study as well as in this study, were not counted, about 70 percent of the values within the value types were found to be compatible.

The American students surveyed for this study preferred individualist values and mixed value types over the collectivist type as indicated by the relatively higher means the first two value types garnered relative to the third. The Indian students preferred collectivist and the mixed types over individualistic ones. However, interestingly, the Japanese differed from the American and Indian students inasmuch there is no clear-cut pattern of individualist or collectivist value preference. Results reveal enough anomalies to render any clear-cut pattern invisible.

Although our study attempts to lend support to the universality of Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987) theory of a universal psychological structure of human values with all of the three cultures surveyed, the present study is not able to completely support their findings. However, although this study did find all of the 11 value types represented, it did not confirm that all of the values Schwartz (1990) links with specific value types are compatible. In this study several individualistic items such as "preserving my public image," "social recognition," "being ambitious," and "influential" for example were found to be incompatible. Similarly, several collectivist and mixed values were found not to be compatible with other values with which they were expected to be linked.

Even though our study lends partial support to the theory of universal structure of values, it clearly demonstrates the need to avoid oversimplifying the individualist-collectivist dichotomy. The findings of our study seems to support the idea that no country including the United States, India or Japan should be categorized primarily individualist or collectivist. In fact, several intercultural communication scholars have underscored the inadequacy of the simple individualism-collectivism dichotomy. For example, Schwartz (1990, p.151) has noted "first, the dichotomy leads us to overlook values that inherently serve both individual and collective interests (e.g. maturity values), second, the dichotomy ignores values that foster the

goals of collectives other than the in-group (e.g. universal pro-social values), and 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 and are sometimes not opposed.

Triandis, whose work has employed the value types, concedes that all humans are both individualistic and collectivist: "Individualism and collectivism can coexist and simply emphasize a culture depending upon the situation" (Triandis, 1993, p.162). Schwartz (1990) stresses the need for redefining 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. These inadequacies may be removed if future researchers include the vertical and horizontal dimensions in their studies of diverse cultures. As Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk & Gelfand (1995, p. 279) suggest, "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. This information will allow researchers to make finer distinctions along cultural dimensions than is possible when only individualism and collectivism are considered."

Triandis has measured the dichotomies of individualism and collectivism through the use of scenarios by gathering data on the attitudinal responses of the participants. Triandis, Chen and Chan (1998, p. 288), concluded that the more affluent a collectivist culture has become socially, the more responses no longer reflect collectivist beliefs but individualistic beliefs. Triandis, *et al.*, concluded that the data collected from the use of scenarios was useful when measuring tendencies toward individualism and collectivism at the individual level (1998, p.13). This is a fascinating area of research for future scholars to investigate. Our study did not include any independent variables, such as gender, race, income, or media usage. These independent variables have the potential to explain why individualistic and collectivist orientations may prevail in the same cultures.

References

- Gudykunst, W. B.
 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 *Cultures 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.
- Rokeach, M.
 1973 *The nature of human values*. 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.
 1990 Individualism-collectivism critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, 39-157.
 1988, August Value Types and Structure: Universal and culture-specific aspects. Paper presented at the Ninth Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Newcastle, New South Wales, Australia.
- 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.
 1987 Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-62.
- 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 Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Lincoln:University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H.C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C.H., Mann, C., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J.B.P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, M., & deMontmollin, C.
 1986 The measurement of ethic aspects of individualism and collectivism

- across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 257-67.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucas, N.
1988 Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-in-group relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H., Chen, X. P. & Chan, D. K-S.
1998 Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. . *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29 (2), 275-89.
- Triandis, H.C., Leung, K., Villareal, M., & Clark, F. L.
1985 Allocentric vs. idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H.
1990 Multi method problems of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (5), 1006-20.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucas, N.
1988 Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-in-group relationship. *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., Mann, C., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J.B.P., Verma, J, Spangenberg, J., Touzard, M., & deMontmollin, C..
1986 The measurement of etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38 257-267.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M., & Clark, F. L.
1985 Allocentric vs. idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 395-415.