

Individualism-Collectivism: A Study of College Students in Four Countries

Jung-Soo Yi

Abstract

The major goal of this study was to explore current positions in the individualism-collectivism dimension of college students from four countries: Korea, Japan, The United States, and Canada. On the basis of previous scholarly findings, a questionnaire was developed and distributed to the four countries' 849 college students who reside in their own countries. The findings of the present study ran counter to the findings of previous studies concerning individualism-collectivism degrees between Asian people and North Americans. The findings of the study imply that culture may not be a stagnant phenomenon, and cultural gaps among countries might be less pronounced than currently presumed.

Introduction

Individualism ("I" culture)--Collectivism ("we" culture) is a manifest, but hard-to-understand conceptual dimension of cultural variability used to elucidate different values, beliefs, and attitudes among people from different cultures (Ayyash-Abdo, 2001; Hui & Triandis, 1986; Mann, Radford, & Kanagawa, 1985; Schwartz, 1990). This dimension "reflects the position of the culture on a bipolar continuum" (Hofstede & Bond, 1984, p. 419) and has been used to identify cultural values (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961), work-related values (Hofstede, 1980a), interorganizational interactions (Allerheiligen, Graham, & Lin, 1985), as well as social behavior (Triandis et al., 1984; Wheeler, Reis, & Bond, 1989), religion (Bakan, 1966), language use (Kashima & Kashima, 1998), child-rearing patterns (Berry, 1979), use of decision rules (Mann, 1986; Mann, Radford, & Kanagawa, 1985), and conflict styles (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991).

Description of Individualism and Collectivism

Traditionally, individualism has been identified as "the habit or principle of being independent and self-reliant: self-centered feeling or conduct; egoism" (Jewell & Abate, 2001, p. 865), or "a situation in which people are supposed to look after themselves and their immediate family only" (Hofstede & Bond, 1984, p. 419). This is a common cultural pattern found in most northern and western European countries and in North America (Inkeles, 1983; Triandis et al., 1988b), including Canada (Borden, 1991), which is "extreme by worldwide standards" (Munroe & Munroe, 1975, p. 143). Collectivism, in contrast, represents the cultural values, attitudes, and patterns of people in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Middle East, and the Pacific (Ayyash-Abdo, 2001; Hofstede, 1980b; Hsu, 1971; Triandis et al., 1988a). The term has been used to refer to the general pattern that "pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty" (Hofstede, 1991, p. 51). This characteristic involves "the need to maintain group harmony above the partisan interests of subgroups and individuals"

(Mann, Radford, & Kanagawa, 1985, p. 1557).

The Cultural, Psychological, and Social Perspectives

From the cultural standpoint, the contrast between collectivism and individualism (e.g., Hofstede, 1980b; Kim & Choi, 1994; Sampson, 1975) has been variously labelled as cooperation and individualism (e.g., Mead, 1967), interdependence and individualism (e.g., Waterman, 1981), groupism and individualism (e.g., Banks & McGee Banks, 1993), collaterality and individualism (e.g., Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961), or collectivity-orientation and self-orientation (e.g., Parsons, 1951). From a psychological perspective, the distinction has been discussed in terms of allocentrism (paying primary attention to the needs of a group) and idiocentrism (paying more attention to one's own needs than to the needs of others) (e.g., Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985). Others draw distinctions from sociological perspectives, such as tradition-direction and inner-direction (e.g., Riesman, Glazer, & Denney, 1961) or moral involvement and calculative involvement (e.g., Etzioni, 1975).

From the early 1950s to the 1990s, many scholars and researchers adapted various terms and research methods to distinguish cultural differences as related to their research interests. In spite of the various specific perspectives on cross-cultural differences, most social scientists concerned with such differences have argued that behavioral patterns differ among cultures. People in collectivist societies place importance on harmony, intimacy, sacrifice for the group, interdependence, and cooperation, whereas people in individualistic cultures emphasize self-reliance, independence, and, possibly, competition with other members in the group or the society. Although some cross-cultural researchers disagree about the accuracy and usefulness of the individualism and collectivism dimension (e.g., Schwartz, 1990; Smith, 1978; Waterman, 1981), these characteristics help understand the existence of cultural differences.

Ingroup and Outgroup

Another important aspect in the review of the individualism and collectivism dimension is how people in different cultures interact with others in and out of their group. Drawing on the cultural patterns in social penetration processes (e.g., Altman & Taylor, 1973), Gudykunst, Yoon, and Nishida (1987) examined the distinctive communicative behaviors of ingroup and outgroup relationships between cultures. In this study of communication in relationships with strangers (outgroup) and classmates (ingroup) in Japan, Korea, and the United States, they found that "the greater the degree of collectivism present in a culture, the greater the amount of personalization (e.g., intimacy) and synchronization (e.g., assimilation), but the less the difficulty perceived in communication with classmates" (p. 301).

Because of the emphasis collectivists place on ingroup relations, individualists are more likely to trust strangers and outsiders (Triandis, 1991) and show more attributional confidence regarding strangers (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1986) than collectivists. In other words, members of individualistic cultures experience less social penetration with other people in ingroup relations than do members of collectivistic cultures. These results support findings of previous research (e.g., Leung & Bond, 1984; Triandis, 1988; Wetherall, 1982) in revealing the systematic differences of ingroup and outgroup relationships in collectivistic and individualistic cultures.

Individualists are very good at entering and leaving groups (Triandis et al., 1993), have skill in making friends (Triandis et al., 1988a), but often only establish relatively superficial (Triandis, 1991) and nonintimate relationships (Triandis et al., 1988a) with other members of a group. Collectivists are not very skillful at making new friends, but they "spend much time building relationships" (Triandis, 1991, p. 83) with other members of a group and maintain "a life-long intimate relationship, with many obligations" (Triandis et al., 1988a, p. 325). These cultural traits of ingroup and outgroup relationships support the view that "collectivists pay more attention to the views, needs and goals of their ingroup" (Triandis, 1991, p. 79), whereas "individualists are more concerned with the relation of their behaviors to their own needs, interests, and goals" (Leung & Bond, 1984, p. 794).

Singh, Huang, and Thompson (1962) supported the view that Chinese attach prime importance to social-centered groups in a study of the values held by American, Chinese, and Indian students. They found that Americans, who strive for flexible and many-sided lives, scored highest in self-centered orientation, whereas Chinese students, who enjoy life through group participation and show more concern for other people, scored highest in society-centered orientation. More recently, Hsu (1981) confirmed that view by saying that Americans' "individual-centered way of life which stresses inner-direction or self-reliance" (p. 136) is in direct contrast to the Chinese situation-centered and other-directed way of life "that values mutual dependence" (p. 136). Accordingly, cross-cultural researchers observe more positive response and prosocial behaviors and fewer antisocial and aggressive behaviors among Chinese children, as compared to American children (e.g., Bond & Wang, 1983; Stevenson, 1991).

Whereas members of collectivistic cultures hold the belief that the basic unit of survival in a society is the collective or group, individualists believe the basic unit of their lives is the self (Hui & Villareal, 1989; Triandis et al., 1988b). For example, "the American archetype...seems more attuned to cultivating a self that knows it is unique in the cosmos, the Japanese archetype to a self that can feel human in the company of others" (Plath, 1980, p. 218). This fact and other evidence seem to support the view that the individualism-collectivism dimension clearly shows the general differences among cultures.

Collectivists' emphasis on group harmony, interdependence, and intimate relationships does not necessarily mean that their whole society is harmonious and cooperative. Collectivists tend to believe that everyone else, except the members of their ingroup, is the outgroup (Triandis & Vassiliou, 1972) and view outgroups as "having a low potential for becoming group members" (Leung & Bond, 1984, p. 795). Therefore, their behavior toward outgroups tends to be highly individualistic (Triandis et al., 1988a), and, as a result, cooperation with outsiders, other groups, and outgroups is hard to achieve in collectivistic cultures (Triandis et al., 1988b). This could explain why there have been scenes on television in which legislators from one political party exchange blows with those of another party in Korea, Japan, and Taiwan.

Most, if not all, individuals have similarities to and differences from other individuals; these similarities and differences occur between cultures as well. As we can find individuals who are allocentric or idiocentric in both collectivistic and individualistic cultures, some collectivistic countries might possess more individualistic traits than other collectivistic countries. In other words, although there are many similarities among the people of Korea, Japan, China, and other

collectivistic countries, there are probably some differences among them in their attitudes toward the understanding of individualism and collectivism.

A Japanese scholar describes the Japanese value of social relations with others in the following way:

A Japanese generally must understand where s/he stands in relation to other members of the group or society, and must acknowledge his/her dependence on the others.

Acknowledgement and maintenance of the relative position of others, rather than preservation of an individual's proper territory, governs all social interaction. (Matsumoto, 1988, p. 405)

This statement not only describes the characteristics of social relations of the Japanese, but also other countries classified as the same collectivistic cultures, such as Korea, China, and Taiwan. However, these countries may not share the same level of individualism. In Japan, unlike other highly collectivistic cultures, for example, individualism is now seen as different from "selfishness," is "sought in the pursuit of personal interests and achievements" (Hendry, 1987, p. 49), and is acceptable as long as people's individualistic behaviors do not interfere with their obligations to others (Hendry, 1987; Smith, 1983). Although the Western sense of individualism has begun to emerge in the studies of Japanese national character (Hayashi & Suzuki, 1981), the Japanese sense of individuality differs from that of Western-style individuality in that the Japanese emphasize perfection of the self with self-control rather than self-expression of one's uniqueness (Smith, 1983).

Interestingly, GNP is likely to affect a country's level of individualism and collectivism (Triandis et al., 1988a). A country with a higher GNP is more individualistic, and one with a lower GNP is more collectivistic. Also, research shows that societies with a dense population, agricultural culture, and/or large family size are more apt to be collectivistic cultures, whereas the reverse tends to be true of individualistic cultures (Hofstede, 1980a; Triandis, 1989). Thus, it can be assumed that people would tend to be more individualistic in western countries such as Canada and the United States with higher GNP and sparse population due to larger geographical size when compared to Asian countries in the present study. With larger family size and dense population, people in Korea and Japan could presumably be more collectivistic in their behavioral patterns.

Importance of Understanding Individualism and Collectivism Dimension

As companies in the East prosper and become more global, North American and European enterprises stretch out to foreign countries as well. Also, government officials from many countries interact with others for the benefit of their own countries. These phenomena lead managers, executives, and government officials from differing cultures to be frequently involved in intercultural communication with foreign clients and officials.

Unfortunately, we know relatively little about what causes people from different cultures to

display different values, beliefs, and opinions in interpersonal, intergroup, and other broader contexts of interaction. We know even less about how important a role culture plays in the formation of the levels of individualism and collectivism in various cultures. Interactions with people from other cultures do not generate much confidence in many of us, because often we do not know what to expect nor how to negotiate for meaning. Therefore, understanding the roots of cultural differences, in terms of different levels of individualism and collectivism presented by people from various cultures, is very important and well worth investigating in modern business and social relationships.

One of the two main goals of the present study was to provide a review of relevant theoretical and research literature about Individualism and Collectivism, which has been presented above. The second purpose was to develop procedures for investigating the research question and to collect and analyze data pertaining to it:

RQ1: Do college students from the United States, Canada, Japan, and Korea differ in respect to collectivism-individualism as described in previous studies?

In light of possible differences among these countries in terms of the level of individualism and collectivism, this study not only considers the differences between collectivistic and individualistic cultures, but also the differences among countries included in the study.

Methodology

A questionnaire was constructed to measure the degrees of individualism and collectivism in various categories such as relationship with others in social settings, dealing with interpersonal problems, and perception of cooperation and competition. The questionnaire contained 32 items in the Likert format.

Respondents

Random selection of universities in four participating countries was accomplished after contacting international members listed in the National Communication Association Directory. After the explanation of the research plan and purposes, six of eleven contacted instructors consented to administer the questionnaire in their and their colleagues' classes.

Eight-hundred-forty-nine college students residing in their own countries participated in the study. Twenty-five were excluded from the study for various reasons, such as international student status (18 foreign students at the selected American university and 2 foreign students at the selected Canadian university), and five students who did not complete their consent form for the study.

Of the remaining 824 (male = 419, female = 405) college students, the number of participants representing each country varied (224 Korean: male = 119, female = 105; 202 Japanese: male = 108, female = 94; 200 American: male = 107, female = 93; 198 Canadian; male = 108, female = 90). All 824 participants were included in the statistical analyses.

Because most participating classes involved were required courses,

participants' academic majors varied, but most were in fields in the social sciences, natural sciences, engineering, and arts. Korean respondents were students enrolled in Introduction to Communication Activities, Human Nutrition, and Principles of Marketing classes at a university in Daegu. Japanese respondents were students in Introduction to Chemistry Laboratory, Interpersonal Communication, and Foundation of Art Education at a university in Osaka. American participants were students enrolled in Public Speaking, Honors Program Seminar in Biology, and Economic Life at two universities in Ohio. Canadian respondents were students in Practicum in English Education, English Literature, and The Science of Behavior in Psychology at a university in Alberta.

Because all respondents were college students, there was no significant variation in the age distribution across the subsamples. Canadian participants averaged 22.7 years in age and were the oldest group followed by Japanese (21.7 years), Korean (21.2 years) and American (21.1 years) participants. The oldest participant in the study was an American male aged 42 years, and the youngest was an American female who was 18 years and six months old (18.5 years). All respondents were undergraduate students: freshmen (N = 270); sophomores (N = 205); juniors (N = 176); and seniors (N = 173).

Procedures

The questionnaire, developed in English, was translated into Korean and Japanese by using the method of back-translation (Brislin, 1980) to ensure equivalence of meanings and to provide an equitable opportunity for the participants who do not use English as their native languages. As previously suggested (e.g., Gudykunst et al., 1992; Ting-Toomey et al., 1991) and practiced by other researchers (e.g., Ayyash-Abdo, 2001; Smith, et al. 1998), if precisely translated, a questionnaire in different languages would presumably be the most effective means for obtaining accurate data for intercultural and/or cross-cultural studies. To check and improve translation fidelity, back translation and correction procedures were done by employing native speakers of Korean and Japanese languages.

Instructors at the universities in all four countries were asked to distribute the questionnaires in class and have the students complete and return them as soon as they finished responding to the questionnaires. Students taking a class in a foreign country (N = 20) were excluded from the statistical analysis so as to avoid possible contaminating influences. Students who have been in a foreign country for a certain period of time might have adjusted to the new culture; hence, one could not be sure about which culture would have the greater influence on their responses. The statistical analyses, thus, included data only for native college students in their own countries.

Method of Analysis

Instead of utilizing existing research instruments, the present study developed a new questionnaire to collect data. Therefore, a small scale "trial run" of all the procedures designed for the main study was indispensable. The purpose of the pilot study was to find any flaws that might inhibit accurately analyzing collected data in the main study, find reliability and validity of the items, and make any necessary adjustment before sending the questionnaires to participating

universities.

Respondents in the pilot study were students at the participating American and the Canadian Universities. Those respondents did not participate in the main study. A total of 164 (male = 84; female = 80) students participated in the study in which only English version of the questionnaire was utilized. Among those participants, 156 were undergraduate and eight were graduate students. Distribution of the participants by nations were as follow: The United States (N = 51: male = 30; female = 21), Canada (N = 42: male 25; female = 17), Korea (N = 38: male = 24; female = 14), and Japan (N = 33: male = 19; female = 14).

All procedures of the pilot study, including the distribution and conduct of the questionnaire and the analysis of the collected data, were carefully recorded for the future reference in the main study. Because the procedure in the pilot study did not exhibit any flaws, the main study was conducted in the same manner.

The data analysis for the pilot study disclosed some items with low reliability and/or validity that needed to be revised before they could be included in the main study. The reliability of questionnaire items in the pilot study was .69. Factor analysis for the items produced five factors. Of the 43 items comprised in the pilot study, the number having the highest loading on each factor was 10, 9, 7, 7, 6, and 5, respectively.

After the completion of the data analysis for the pilot study, it was necessary to delete, revise, and divide some items. Ten items were deleted, six items were modified, and 17 items were retained without any revision.

Simple analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to analyze the collected data for the main study. Individualism and collectivism dimension was the dependent variables and nationality was the independent variable. A mean score for each respondent was the unit of analysis. Significant F -ratios were followed with the Duncan Multiple Range test.

After the data were collected, factor analysis was again utilized to determine whether items were consistent with those derived from previous research. Factor analysis for the main study produced two factors. Of the 32 items comprised in the main study, the number having the highest loading on each factor was 22, 8, and 2, respectively. This was done also because the newly developed instrument requires evidence to support the claim that such scores could indeed be interpreted as indicators of the intention of the study. The data were also analyzed in terms of demographic characteristics, such as gender, average age, class standing, and academic major. There were no specific hypotheses for these variables, however.

Questions in the Likert format were scored in the following manner. For each statement, "5" represents "strongly agree," "4" represents "agree," "3" represents "no opinion," "2" represents "disagree," and "1" represents "strongly disagree." Reliability was assessed in terms of Cronbach's alpha coefficient for inter-item consistency.

Wordings of seven items in the study were reversed. In those cases, questions were negatively composed so that agreement actually means disagreement when items were again reversed for statistical analysis. The main purpose of the reverse scoring was to increase the prospects that participants would more carefully distinguish among items.

Results

The findings of the present study did not support the research question that people from Japan and Korea would show more collectivistic tendencies while people from the United States and Canada would present more individualistic characteristics. Thus, the findings did not correspond with the previous scholarly findings.

Table 1 exhibits the mean level of questionnaire items for each country (see Table 1). The mean score could range from a high of 160 to a low of 0, with 80 being the mid point. Canadian participants scored highest ($M = 139.3359$; $SD = 38.2$) for collectivistic characteristics and the scores were significantly higher than the scores of the respondents from two Asian countries ($F = 7.45$; $df = 1$; $p = .05$). A high score for this measure reports Canadian participants' greater degree of collectivistic tendencies. American participants' scores ($M = 138.45335$; $SD = 36.4$) were not significantly lower than the scores of Canadian participants but significantly higher than the scores of Japanese and Korean participants ($F = 6.25$; $df = 1$; $p = .05$). Japanese ($M = 125.3409$; $SD = 28.6$) participants positioned in the third of the rank order. Korean participants turned out to be least collectivistic ($M = 123.3245$; $SD = 28.4$) among all four countries, $F(4, 804) = 11.78$, $p < .0005$. The mean score difference between the countries with the highest score (Canada) and the lowest score (Korea) was 16.0114. This results suggest that Hofstede's cultural dimension is not always applicable. In fact, for these participants, the data are opposite of what one would expect from Hofstede's (1980b) data.

The reliability for questionnaire items was .91. Since the survey was conducted in three languages, however, it was necessary to analyze factors and reliability separately for each nation.

Factor analysis for the questionnaire items produced two factors for all four countries with different loading on factors (Canadian: 24, 6; American: 22, 7; Korean: 21, 8; Japanese: 22, 8). As it was presumed, the reliability of the study for each country was slightly different as well (Canadian: .91; American: .90; Japanese: .92; Korean: .89).

The questionnaire items were developed to measure the participants' collectivistic characteristics. In twenty-one items of the 32 item questionnaire, both Canadian and American participants scored higher than those of Korean and Japanese participants. For example, item number one in the questionnaire asked the respondents: "If a relative were to ask me for financial help, even without guaranteeing to pay me back, I would still help within my means." For this item, Canadian participants scored highest ($M = 4.25$) followed by American participants ($M = 4.16$). Although the importance of kin relations is emphasized in Japan (Hendry, 1987), and in Korea (Korean Overseas Information Service, 1983), participants from these countries scored lower than those from Canada and the United States (Japan: $M = 3.27$; and Korea: $M = 3.10$). Although the concept of money could have been a factor in shaping responses to the item, the data suggest that Canadian and American participants care more about their relatives than do Japanese and Korean participants.

In only six items did Japanese ($M = 24.6$; $SD = 5.6$) and Korean ($M = 23.8$; $SD = 5.2$) participants score higher than American ($M = 19.8$; $SD = 4.4$) and Canadian ($M = 19.6$; $SD = 4.1$) participants ($F = 4.35$; $df = 1$; $p = .05$). For example, item number six in the questionnaire

asked the respondents: "Without the help of others who love and care about me, I would not be where I am and what I am today." For this item, Korean participants scored highest ($M = 4.37$) followed by Japanese participants ($M = 4.17$). Both American ($M = 3.39$) and Canadian ($M = 3.28$) scored significantly lower than participants from two other Asian countries ($F = 1.05$; $df = 1$; $p = 0.5$). The fact that people in the West emphasize the importance of individual autonomy (Persell, 1984) and the development of an independent child (Munroe & Munroe, 1975) could have been a factor for different scores between Asian and North American participants. In fact, both Japanese (Hendry, 1987) and Korean (Korean Overseas Information Service, 1983) emphasize the importance of human relations in child development. Rather than developing an independent child, Japanese and Korean parents place much greater importance on establishing interdependent and harmonious relations between the child and other members of the family and society.

Discussion and Implications

It is well known to Asian people that the Japanese have a stronger sense of individuality and show more competitive behavior (Shwalb et al., 1991) when compared to people of other Asian countries. Thus, it was thought possible that Japanese participants would be less collectivistic than Korean participants. Also, it was not anticipated that people from Canada and the United States would turn out to be more collectivistic than the people from two other countries in the study: Korea and Japan. This ran counter to the findings of previous studies concerning cultural differences between Asian people and North Americans. Most of these studies have found that people from Asian countries show more concern for other people and the consequences of the behaviors on their ingroup members, whereas people from Western Europe and North America are more concerned with attainment of their own personal goals.

It is important to understand that the cultures of many Asian countries are changing and westernizing very rapidly, and "individual behavior and personality changes constitute the internal dynamics of cultural change" (Segall et al., 1990, p. 295). Especially young adults, such as college students, are apt to assimilate western cultures more readily than older generations. What seems applicable and relevant to the way we understand the cultural differences from a group of 40- to 50-year-olds may be inappropriate to a group of 20- to 30-year-olds. Also, what seemed applicable and relevant to the way we comprehend the cultural differences a few years ago may not be appropriate today. Thus, no affirmation can be made of the fact the United States will still be remain as an individualistic and Korea as a collectivistic culture in the foreseeable future.

Change in any society can be attributed to both intracultural (e.g., population, GNP, family patterns, and political orientation) and intercultural (e.g., number of interrelated countries and the degree of political, commercial, and social relationships with other countries) factors. Changes in these factors influence people's beliefs, values, and behavioral patterns. Although no one can know which culture will change and in which direction or at what rate, it is certain that culture will change as long as social conditions in the culture change and relationships among different cultures continue.

Interaction among members of different cultural groups is an increasingly common aspect of modern life, as more and more people study, work, or settle in cultures other than their own. Increasing relationships among cultures, however, does not mean that all cultures will become similar. As evident in the present study, cultural differences exist. However, although careful investigations are necessary before making an assertion, general differences among cultures might not be as significant as people think or as significant as they once were.

Suggestions for Future Research

All participants of this study were college students from four different countries. This group did not constitute representative samples of the populations involved. Although they might represent college students or the young in general in their countries, one cannot generalize the findings of the study to the populations in the countries represented. People with different professions, age, and socio-economic status might have different attitudes and values, as well as different ways of expressing themselves. In light of the restrictions in the current sample, future studies should include people from various groups, such as college students, government officials, and people in corporations, with an appropriate proportions of males and females. Although it might be more difficult to interpret the findings, this type sample selection could help draw more reliable information from future cross-cultural studies, which could be applied to the larger population.

Another limitation that should be carefully considered in the future study is the location of participating universities. This study was conducted with students from four countries, but the geographical locations of participating universities were not comparable in terms of the size and their characteristics. Japanese university in the present study is located in the city with more than three million people and participating Korean university is located in the city with more than two million people. Both American and Canadian universities in the study, however, are located in medium-sized urban cities with less than a half million people.

Because people in the same country do not necessarily present similar behavioral patterns (e.g., Olson, 1975; Wu, 1985), it would be desirable to include various geographical locations in the study to yield more reliable findings. Because cultural differences noted in the present study may have reflected differences in type of locale, it is obvious that careful selection of comparable locations should be a matter of importance in future cross-cultural studies.

Table 1

Collectivism-Individualism Differences Among Cultures

	Number of items/	Overall score
--	------------------	---------------

	Possible score	(Mean)
Korea	32/160	123.3245
Japan	32/160	125.3409
The United States	32/160	138.4535
Canada	32/160	139.3359

References

- Allerheiligen, R., Graham, J. L., & Lin C. Y. (1985). Honesty in interorganizational negotiations in the United States, Japan, Brazil, and the Republic of China. Journal of Macromarketing, Fall, 4-16.
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. (1973). Social penetration processes. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ayyash-Abdo, H (2001). Individualism and collectivism: The case of Lebanon. Social Behavior and Personality, 29, 503-518.
- Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (1993). Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Berry, J. W. (1979). A cultural ecology of social behavior. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 12., pp. 177-207). New York: Academic Press.

- Bond, M. H., & Wang, S. H. (1983). China: Aggressive behavior and the problem of maintaining order and harmony. In A. P. Goldstein & M. H. Segall (Eds.), Aggression in global perspective (pp. 58-74). New York: Pergamon.
- Borden, G. A. (1991). Cultural orientation: An approach to understanding intercultural communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. In H. C. Triandis & H. W. Berry (Eds.), Handbook of cross-cultural psychology (Vol.2., pp. 389-444). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and their correlates. New York: Free Press.
- Georgas, J. (1989). Changing family values in Greece: From collectivist to individualist. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20, 80-91.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Gao, G., Schmidt, K. L., Nishida, T., Bond, M. H., Wang, G., & Barraclough, R. A. (1992). The influence of individualism-collectivism, self-monitoring, and predicted-outcome value on communication in ingroup and outgroup relationships. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23, 196-213.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1986). The influence of cultural variability on perceptions of communication behavior associated with relationship terms. Human Communication Research, 13, 147-166.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Yoon, Y. C., & Nishida, T. (1987). The influence of individualism-collectivism on perceptions of communication in ingroup and outgroup relationships. Communication Monographs, 54, 295-306.
- Hayashi, C., & Suzuki, T. (1981). Changes in belief systems, quality of life issues, and social conditions over 25 years in postwar Japan. Annual Institute of Statistics, 36, 135-161.
- Hendry, J. (1987). Understanding Japanese society. New York: Croom Helm.
- Hofstede, G. (1980a). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980b). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? Organizational Dynamics, 9, 42-63.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). Organizations and cultures: Software of the mind. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15, 417-433.
- Hsu, F. L. K. (1971). Psychosocial homeostasis and jen: Conceptual tools for advancing psychological anthropology. American Anthropologist, 73, 23-44.
- Hsu, F. L. K. (1981). Americans and Chinese: Passage to differences (3rd ed.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17, 222-248.
- Hui, C. H., & Villareal, M. J. (1989). Individualism-collectivism and psychological need: Their relationships in two cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20, 310-323.
- Inkeles, A. (1983, November-December). The American character. The Center Magazine, 17,

25-39.

- Jewell, E. J., & Abate, F. (Eds.). (2001). The new Oxford American dictionary. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kashima, E. S. & Kashima, Y. (1998). Culture and Language: The case of cultural dimensions and personal pronoun use. Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 29, 461-486.
- Kim, U., & Choi, S. (1994). Individualism, collectivism, and child development: A Korean perspective. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), Cross-cultural roots of minority child development (pp. 227-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). Variations in value orientation. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Korean Overseas Information Service: Ministry of Culture and Information. (1983). A handbook of Korea. Seoul, Korea: Samhwa Printing Co.
- Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1984). The impact of cultural collectivism on reward allocation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 793-804.
- Mann, L. (1986). Cross-cultural studies of rules for determining majority and minority decision rights. Australian Journal of Psychology, 38, 319-328.
- Mann, L., Radford, M., & Kanagawa, C. (1985). Cross-cultural differences in children's use of decision rules: A comparison between Japan and Australia. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1557-1564.
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. Journal of Pragmatics, 12, 403-426.
- Mead, M. (1967). Cooperation and competition among primitive people. Boston: Beacon.
- Munroe, R. L., & Munroe, R. H. (1975). Cross-cultural human development. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Olson, N. J. (1975). Social class and rural-urban patterning of socialization in Taiwan. Journal of Asian Studies, 34, 659-674.
- Parsons, T. (1951). The social system. New York: Free Press.
- Persell, C. H. (1984). Understanding society: An introduction to sociology. New York: Harper & Row.
- Plath, D. W. (1980). Long engagements: Maturity in modern Japan. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Riesman, D., Glazer, N., & Denney, R. (1961). The lonely crowd: A study of the changing American character. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sampson, E. E. (1977). Psychology and the American ideal. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 767-782.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21, 139-157.
- Segall, M. H., Dasen, P. R., Berry, J. W., & Poortinga, Y. H. (1990). Human behavior in global perspective: An introduction to cross-cultural psychology. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shwalb, D. W., Shwalb, B. J., & Murata, K. (1991). Individualistic striving and group dynamics

- of fifth-and eighth-grade Japanese boys. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *22*, 347-361.
- Singh, P. N., Huang, S. C., & Thompson, G. G. (1962). A comparative study of selected attitudes, values, and personality characteristics of American, Chinese, and Indian students. Journal of Social Psychology, *57*, 123-132.
- Smith, M. B. (1978). Perspective on selfhood. American Psychologist, *33*, 1053-1063.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., Peterson, M., & Leung K. (1998). Individualism: Collectivism and the handling of disagreement. A 23 country study. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, *22*, 351-367
- Smith, R. J. (1983). Japanese society: Tradition, self and the social order. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevenson, H. C. (1991). The development of prosocial behavior in large-scale collective societies: China and Japan. In R. A. Hinde & J. Groebel (Eds.), Cooperation and prosocial behavior (pp. 89-105). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G., Trubisky, P., Yang, Z., Kim, H. K., Lin, S., & Nishida, T. (1991). Culture, face maintenance, and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: A study in five cultures. The International Journal of Conflict Management, *2*, 275-296.
- Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism vs. individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology, In G. Verma & C. Bagley (Eds.), Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes and cognition (pp. 60-95). London: MacMillan.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. Psychological Review, *96*, 506-520.
- Triandis, H. C. (1991). Cross-cultural differences in assertiveness/competition vs. Group loyalty/cooperation. In R. A. Hinde & J. Groebel (Eds.), Cooperation and prosocial behavior (pp. 78-88). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988a). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *54*, 323-338.
- Triandis, H. C., Brislin, R., & Hui, C. H. (1988b). Cross-cultural training across the individualism-collectivism divide. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, *12*, 269-289.
- Triandis, H. C., Hui, C. H., Albert, R. D., Leung, S. M., Lisansky, J., Diaz-Loving, R., Plascencia, L., Marin, G., Betancourt, H., & Loyola-Clintron, L. (1984). Individual models of social behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *46*, 1389-1404.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. Journal of Research in Personality, *19*, 395-415.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., Betancourt, H., Iwao, S., Leung, K., Salazar, J. M., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Touzard, H., & Zaleski, Z. (1993). An etic-emic analysis of individualism and collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *24*, 366-383.
- Triandis, H. C., & Vassiliou, V. (1972). A comparative analysis of subjective culture. In H. C. Triandis (Ed.), The analysis of subjective culture (pp. 299-338). New York: Wiley.

- Waterman, A. S. (1981). Individualism and interdependence. American Psychologist, 36, 762-773.
- Wetherall, M. (1982). Cross-cultural studies of minimal groups: Implications for the social identity theory of intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), Social identity and intergroup relations (pp. 207-240). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheeler, L., Reis, H. T., & Bond, M. H. (1989). Collectivism-individualism in everyday social life: The Middle Kingdom and the melting pot. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 79-86.
- Wu, D. H. (1985). Child training in Chinese culture. In W. S. Tseng & D. Y. H. Wu (Eds.), Chinese culture and mental health (pp. 113-134). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Appendix 1
Sample Statements included in the Questionnaire

- SA: Strongly agree
 A: Agree
 NO: No opinion, Undecided
 D: Disagree
 SD: Strongly disagree

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|----|---|----|
| 1. | If a relative were to ask me for financial help, even without guaranteeing to pay me back, I would still help within my means. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 2. | My happiness is not closely related to the happiness of people around me, such as my family, friends, and relatives. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 3. | Even though I might enjoy certain activities (for example, gambling, drinking alcohol, or illegal drugs), I would refrain from them if I believed that they would have bad effects on my family. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 4. | If I could, I would discuss a personal problem with my friends or relatives rather than struggle through it by myself. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 5. | I do not believe my friends would help if they found me in financial trouble. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|----|---|----|
| 6. | Without the help of others who love and care about me, I would not be where I am and what I am today. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 7. | If a friend asks for help (for example, the person has a dead automobile battery or is locked out of his/her apartment) after midnight, I would not help him/her if I had to wake up early in the morning for school or work. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 8. | If my parents did not like my intended spouse whom I love, I would be unlikely to marry him/her. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 9. | If my neighbors were making noise at night (for example, stereo in high volume or children running upstairs), I would wait for them to become quiet rather than confront them. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 10. | My parents' pleasure is my pleasure, and their pain is my pain. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 11. | If an elderly person stepped onto a bus or a subway and found no empty seat, I would be the first one to yield seat to him/her. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 12. | I would not lend my personal belongings (for example, my stereo, bicycle, or set of golf clubs) to my relatives. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 13. | Winning a game is more important than doing my best and cooperating with teammates. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 14. | If people I do not know need help (for example, finding places or changing flat tires), I am willing to provide it. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 15. | I would not mind sleeping in the same | SA | A | NO | D | SD |

bedroom with my children even if doing so limits the privacy of my spouse and me. (answer even if you do not presently have children)

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|----|---|----|
| 16. | If I had a job, I would think that an increase in salary would be more important than maintaining good relationships with my co-workers. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 17. | Even if other people reveal personal things about themselves (including negative or embarrassing aspects), I am not willing to talk about myself. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 18. | I prefer working with people new to me rather than people I know. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 19. | I would feel responsible if a family member did a misdeed (for example, cause financial loss or physical injury) to other people. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |
| 20. | My parents used to emphasize the importance of love among family members. | SA | A | NO | D | SD |

Jung-Soo Yi is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication at Wright State University in Dayton, OH.