Using Cultural Values as a Measure of Intercultural Sensitivity

Janet Blue
Illinois State University

Suraj Kapoor
Illinois State University

Mark Comadena
Illinois State University

Abstract

This study further examines Schwartz's and Bilsky's measures of universal values in an individualist-collectivist setting. Using a modified form of these measures, 26 of the 52 measures, our study asks American and Indian students to rate these 26 values first as residents of their home country and then as if they were residents of the other country. Our study discovered a possible flaw in the selection of the 26 measures. Respondents to the survey had a difficult time perceiving what life may be like in another country.

Introduction

Intercultural sensitivity is an important construct in the study of Intercultural Communication. However, attempts to measure this construct have been unsuccessful because researchers have failed to adequately specify the range of behaviors that reflect on an individual's sensitivity to other cultures. To address this concern, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) designed an instrument to measure intercultural sensitivity by examining subjects' responses to items reflecting individualist-collectivist orientations. Kapoor and Comadena (1996) attempted to test the construct validity of Bhawuk & Brislin's measure and concluded that due to ambiguity in the tone and direction of the items used, the measure was relatively unreliable. The current project seeks to test Schwartz's and Bilsky's (1992) measure of universal values in individualist-collectivist setting in an attempt to explore its validity in assessing intercultural sensitivity. More specifically, this study will use universal value structure measure in both individualist (U.S.) and collectivist (India) cultures to test the universal application of the measure. In addition, the study will explore the role of mass media in perpetuating intercultural sensitivity.

Problem Definition

The term intercultural sensitivity has been used frequently in the discussion of cross cultural adjustment, task effectiveness during assignments abroad, and the development and maintenance of good interpersonal relationships with culturally diverse others. Intercultural sensitivity has been investigated in scholarly studies of overseas Americans (Cleveland, Mangone & Adams, 1960; Brislin, 1981; Gudykunst & Kim, 1984) as well as in the work of practitioners who work closely with people that engage in extensive intercultural encounters (Kiineberg & Mull, 1979; Paige, 1986; Frankenstein & Mossini, 1988).

Scholars and practitioners disagree, however, on the relative importance of, and actual attention to, intercultural sensitivity in understanding people's behavior in cross-cultural encounters.

One reason for the contradiction between the rated importance and actual attention to, intercultural sensitivity, is that there are few reliable and valid instruments available to measure the construct (Bhawuk & Brislin 1992).

The Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory Scale (ICIS), developed by Bhawuk & Brislin (1992) was designed to address this limitation in the literature. They argued that "to be effective in other cultures, people must be interested in other cultures, be sensitive enough to notice cultural differences and they must also be willing to modify their behavior as an indication of respect for people of other cultures. A reasonable term that summarized these qualities of people is intercultural sensitivity."

One way to measure intercultural sensitivity is to determine whether people can modify their behavior appropriately and successfully when moving from one culture to another. To guide the development of an instrument, it is essential to find a dimension that groups cultures and is associated with specific behaviors. Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) selected individualism - collectivism as that dimension for categorizing cultures.

Individualist-Collectivist Concept

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

To test intercultural sensitivity, Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) selected 46 Likert-type items designed to assess one's flexibility and open-mindedness when interacting with members from other cultures. Although, the researchers reported positive results in using ICSI as a measure to assess intercultural sensitivity, the research efforts to reuse their instrument in measuring intercultural sensitivity as a construct have not turned out to be very productive. Kapoor and Comadena (1996), for instance, after using the test in a study of American and Mexican students concluded that the measure is rather ineffective in assessing "other" culture's typical behavior pattern. They indicate that both American and Mexican students when called upon to evaluate other culture's behavior pattern in terms of individualist-collectivist dichotomy, failed to correctly identify the expected behavioral traits.

One problem with the Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) instrument is that the items used to measure behavior patterns are rather abstract in tone and substance. Kapoor & Comadena (1996)

argued that the items used in the measure were rather ineffective in assessing everyday conduct peculiarities unless the subjects had an opportunity to study a specific culture from close quarters.

One option to rectify this deficiency is to substitute the items used by Bhawuk & Brislin (1992) with value items as developed by Schwartz and Bilsky (1992). Their instrument consisting of 56 individualist, collectivist, and mixed values has been tested in more than 30 diverse cultures. Apart from that, their study of universal structure of values has been replicated in the United States with extremely consistent results.

Universal Values Structure

In both of Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987, 1990) studies, Rokeach's (1973) value scale, which is comprised of 36 values, was used. The findings from their studies supported the view that individuals in seven countries, including the United States, experienced seven value types as distinct. These value types included nomenclature, pro-social, restrictive conformity, enjoyment, achievement, maturity, self-direction, and security. In 1992, Schwartz modified his and Bilsky's types and specified 11 human value types. The theory also underlined a set of dynamic relations among the motivational types of values. The proponents of the theory posited that actions be 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 not only found strong evidence of compatibility among value types that support self-reliance (self-direction, maturity); self-enhancement (achievement, enjoyment); and self-other relations (security, restrictive conformity, pro-sociality), the researchers also found that these compatibility's recurred in each of the cultures studied.

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

In our study, we propose to use this instrument with a view to exploring the construct validity of the instrument. More specifically, the study will use the value instrument in both individualist (U.S.) and collectivist (India) cultures to test the universal application of the measure in the assessment of intercultural sensitivity.

In addition, this study will explore the role of mass media in perpetuating intercultural sensitivity. To date, no research has explored the role television plays in the development and perpetuation of intercultural sensitivity. Television is a very powerful medium and may have profound effect on viewers' levels of intercultural sensitivity.

Objectives: As far as the objectives are concerned, we intend to test the validity of Schwartz & Bilsky's universal value instrument in estimating intercultural sensitivity in individualist-collectivist settings. Specifically, we seek answers to the following research questions:

1. Is the universal structure of values a construct valid measure of intercultural sensitivity?
2. Does the value measure have universal application?
3. To what extent does television viewing habits contribute to one's level of intercultural sensitivity?

Significance to the Discipline: This investigation proposes to contribute to the study of intercultural communication in two ways:

First, the individualist-collectivist value literature has been shown to be effective in distinguishing the characteristic traits of various cultures. This concept has the potential to contribute effectively in the area of intercultural sensitivity. Our study seeks to empirically test this potential. In other words, our study plans to provide universally applicable evidence to support or refute the contention that the individualist-collectivist concept can be used effectively to measure intercultural sensitivity.

Second, scholars in the areas of intercultural sensitivity have completely overlooked the role of social and cultural factors which account for intercultural sensitivity or insensitivity. We propose to focus on television, a significant cultural institution, in an attempt to determine if and how it affects cultural sensitivity of students in collectivist and individualist societies. This study, then, will make an important contribution to the intercultural communication literature.

Practical Implications: In addition to contributing to the area of intercultural sensitivity, our study has the potential of assisting the business world in selecting the most suitable employees for dealing with the inhabitants of other cultures, both at home and abroad. First, if people lack intercultural sensitivity they may be unsuccessful in accomplishing the goals of their overseas and at-home assignments. Further, the costs involved in calling back unsuccessful business people, the administrative inconvenience of substitution for the returnees, and disruption of people's lives are very high. Third, because of the rapid growth of international business no country can survive without participation in the world trade. The reality of an increasing global marketplace underscores of intercultural effectiveness for business people the world over (Adler, 1991).

Method

Indian Study

A self-administered questionnaire in English language was administered in November 1996 to 187 college students attending a large northern university. The questionnaire contained detailed questions on media habits, gender, income level, religion and political beliefs. It began with a 26-item value scale, based on Schwartz's and Bilsky's (1992) instrument of value structure.

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.

Respondents' value orientations were assessed using a 26-item Likert-type scale developed by Schwartz and Bilsky. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on these items, and in each case only a single factor with an eigenvalue of more than 1.0 was found. The scales yielded factor scores of at least .*50*. The dimensions tapped by the indices are as follows:

Living in India

1. Collectivist/Individualist: Seven indices that measure the sample's orientation with respect to individualistic/collectivist values include three collectivist (7, 9 and 18), three individualist (13, 16 and 25), and one mixed (5) values (alpha = .67, eigenvalue = 4.1, and total variance = 16%).
2. Mixed: Five indices which measure the respondents' mixed values consist of three mixed (1, 4 and 15) and two collectivist (20 and 26) values (alpha = .55, eigenvalue = 2.3 and total variance = 24%).
3. Individualist: Six indices which assess the Indian subjects' individualist values consist of five (8, 12, 21, 22 and 23) individualist, one mixed (11) and one collectivist (17) values (alpha = .52, eigenvalue = 2.1 and total variance = 32%).
4. Individualist/Mixed: Seven indices comprising of Indian respondents' individualist/mixed values include five (2, 6, 8, 19, and 21) individualist values and two (10 and 14) mixed values (alpha = .43, eigenvalue = 1.9 and total variance = 40%).

Living in the U.S.

1. Mixed/Collectivist: Ten indices which assess the samples' values include five (1,4,5,11 and 15) mixed and five (7, 9, 20, 24, and 26) collectivist values (alpha = .86, eigenvalue = 5.1 and total variance = 20%).
2. Individualist: Five indices measure respondents' values include four (12, 13, 19, and *2*5) values and one (14) mixed value (alpha = .70, eigenvalue = 4.0 and total variance = 35%).
3. Individualist: Seven indices which measure the subjects' individualist values include five (2, 3, 12, 22 and 23) individualist, one (5) mixed and one (17) collectivist values (alpha = .72, eigenvalue = 2.2, and total variance = 44%).

4. Miscellaneous: Three indices which assess the subjects' values include one (9) collective, one (10) mixed and one (21) individualist values (alpha = .14, eigenvalue = 1.7 and total variance = 50%).

American Study

Americans Living in India:

1. Individualist: Six indices measure American respondents values which include five (3, 6, 16, 23 and 25) and one (1) mixed value (alpha = .76, eigenvalue = 4.1, and total variance = 16%).
2. Collectivist/Individualist: Seven indices which assess subjects' values include three (7,18 and 19) collectivist, three (8, 13 and 21) individualist and one (14) mixed values (alpha = .75, eigenvalue = 2.1 and total variance = 24%).

3. Collectivist/ Mixed: Nine indices measure subjects' values which include six (9, 17, 18, 20, 24, and 26) collectivist and four (4, 5, 11, and 15) mixed values (alpha = .71, eigenvalue = 2.1, and total variance = 33%).
4. Miscellaneous: Two indices which measure respondents' values include (12 and 22) individualist and one (1) mixed values (alpha = .37, eigenvalue = 1.9 and total variance = 40%).

Americans Living in United States

1. Individualist: Nine indices which measure respondents' values include eight (2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 16, 21, 22 and 23) individualist and one (5) mixed values (alpha = .79, eigenvalue = 5.1 and total variance = 20%).
2. Individualist/Mixed: Five indices assess subjects' values which include two (1 and 15) mixed, two (8 and 13) individualist and one (7) collectivist values (alpha = .67, eigenvalue = 4.0, and total variance = 35%).
3. Collectivist: Five indices which measure respondents' values include three (18, 19, and 20) collectivist, one (11) mixed and one (13) individualist values (alpha = .69, eigenvalue = 2.2, and total variance = 44%).
4. Collectivist/ Mixed: Four indices measure the subjects' values which include two (34 and 40) mixed and two (9 and 24) collectivist values (alpha = .70, eigenvalue = 1.7 and total variance = 51%).

See Appendix 1

The independent variable in this study is the amount of television viewing among American and Indian students. The series of questions about television viewing is very detailed. There are questions concerning viewing habits during the week, as well as types of programming viewed. Analysis was partitioned into light (less than an hour daily), moderate (2 to 5 hours daily), and heavy (more than 5 hours daily), television viewing, with continuous data used in partial correlations.

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

Results

Indian Study

Mean comparison: t-tests for paired samples were computed to compare Indian samples' responses on individualist, collectivist and mixed values as they would rate while residing in India and in the United States. The results show that the two categories responses had statistically significant differences with respect to collectivist and mixed value types. With regard to collectivist and mixed value types. Indian respondents tended to offer more collectivist and mixed values types, while rating as residents in India as compared to as United States residents.

Table 1
t-Test for paired Samples
Indian Study

Individualist Variable

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Indian in India	163	5.20	.7990
Indian in America		5.19	

Collectivist Variable

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Indian in India	163	5.18	.000 *
Indian in America		4.67	

Mixed Variable

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Indian in India	163	4.77	.000 *
Indian in America		4.41	

When t-tests were conducted for the 26 items separately, on seventeen value statements, the respondents differed statistically significantly. Out of five (2, 6, 12, 13 and 16) statistically significant individualistic items, Indians as Indian residents have higher means on three of them and lower means on the remaining two. Thus on this value types, there is no clear cut pattern. All of the seven (7, 9, 17, 18, 20, 24 and 26) statistically significant collectivist statements have higher means for Indians as Indian residents as compared to their perceptions as American residents. Similarly all of the seven (1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14 and 15) statistically significant mixed statements have higher means when rated by Indians as Indian residents.

Table 2
t-Test for Paired Sample Variables
Indian Study

	Variable	Type	N	Mean India	Mean American	F. Prob	Sig.
1.	Equality	M	163	5.70	5.25	.000	*
2.	Social Power	I	163	4 .25	3.56	.000	*

3.	Pleasure	I	163	5.87	5.38	.285	
4.	Spiritual Life	M	163	3.20	2.94	.032	*
5.	Sense of Belong	M	163	5.51	4.87	.000	*
6.	An Exciting Life	I	163	5.43	5.22	.040	*
7.	Politeness	C	163	5.34	4.92	.001	*
8.	Creativity	I	163	5.14	5.20	.653	
9.	Mature Love	C	163	5.37	4.88	.001	*
10.	Detachment	M	163	2.27	2.15	.231	
11.	Family Security	M	163	6.11	5.39	.000	*
12.	Social Recognition	I	163	5.52	5.19	.008	*
13.	Varied Life	I	163	4.51	5.11	.000	*
14.	Wisdom	M	163	5.47	5.47	.953	
15.	Social Justice	M	163	5.15	4.77	.002	*
16.	Independent	I	163	5.67	6.07	.000	*
17.	Moderate	C	163	4.37	3.99	.005	*
18.	Loyal	C	163	5.60	5.31	.013	*
19.	Ambitious	I	163	6.18	5.87	.398	
20.	Honoring Parents	C	163	6.24	5.50	.000	*
21.	Capable	I	163	5.34	5.56	.071	
22.	Preserving Public Image	I	163	5.28	5.03	.074	
23.	Enjoying Life	I	163	5.36	5.49	.303	
24.	Devout	C	163	4.70	3.77	.000	*
25.	Curious	I	163	4.34	4.38	.752	
26.	Forgiving	C	163	4.64	4.36	.050	*

Demographic Variables:

Regarding demographic variables, gender was a statistically significant independent variable when Indians rated individualist values as Indian residents with males opting for more of such values. On collectivist and individualist values, there were no statistically significant differences. Indians as American residents for gender as an independent variable did not show any statistically significant differences on any of the value types.

Table 3

Indians Living in India
Gender

Individualist Value

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.

Male	20	5.71	.0039 *
Female	143	5.12	
Total	163	5.20	

Collectivist Value

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Male	20	5.20	.9061
Female	143	5.18	
Total	163	5.18	

Mixed Value

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Male	20	4.70	.6042
Female	143	4.78	
Total	163	4.78	

Regarding Indians living as Indian residents, heavy television viewers opted for more individualist values as demonstrated by statistically significant differences between that group and medium and light viewing respondents for that value type. On collectivist and mixed value types, there were no significant differences.

Table 4

Hours Spent Watching Television
Indians in India
Individualist Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	34	5.19	.0086 *
2	124	5.15	
3	5	6.35	
Total	163	5.20	

Collectivist Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	34	5.30	.5867
2	124	5.15	
3	5	5.03	
Total	163	5.18	

Mixed Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	34	4.68	.5973
2	124	4.80	
3	5	4.69	
Total	163	4.77	

Group 1 = Less than I hour per day watching TV
Group 2 = Watching TV more 2 - 5 hours per day
Group 3 = Watching TV more than 5 hours per day

As far as Indians as American residents, television viewing was not a significant factor in value rating. When examining the independent variable of income, there was no significant factor in value rating both in the cases of Indians as Indian residents and Indians as American residents.

American Study

Mean comparison: t-tests for paired sample were computed to compare American students' responses on individualist, collectivist and mixed values as they would rate them both as American living in India as well as living in the United States. The results show that the two sets of responses had statistically significant differences with respect to individualist and collectivist value types. In the case of individualist values, American as Indian residents perceive themselves as more supporting that value type than Americans residing in the United States. Similarly, Americans as American residents prefer collectivist values in comparison with Americans as Indian residents.

Table 5

t-Test for Paired Samples
American Study

Individualist Variable

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
American in America	135	5.05	.021 *
American in India		5.22	

Collectivist Variable

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
American in America	135	5.16	.048 *
American in India		5.03	

Mixed Variable

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
American in America	135	5.13	.777
American in India		5.11	

When tests were conducted for the 26 items separately, on the nine value statement, the respondents' differed statistically significantly. On all of the four (2, 3, 6 and 8) individualist value statements, Americans as American residents scored higher means. On all the three (18, 20 and 24) collectivist values, Americans as Indian residents scored statistically significant higher means.

Table 6
t-Test for Paired Sample Variables
American Study

	Variable	Type	N	Mean India	Mean American	F. Prob	Sig.
1.	Equality	M	135	5.68	5.42	.077	
2.	Social Power	I	135	3.69	3.11	.000	*
3.	Pleasure	I	135	5.60	5.20	.003	*
4.	Spiritual Life	M	135	4.28	4.70	.004	*
5.	Sense of Belong	M	135	5.49	5.27	.080	
6.	An Exciting Life	I	135	5.72	5.28	.004	*
7.	Politeness	C	135	5.29	5.36	.539	
8.	Creativity	I	135	5.49	5.15	.006	*
9.	Mature Love	C	135	5.67	5.68	.950	
10.	Detachment	M	135	3.53	3.22	.064	
11.	Family Security	M	135	5.96	6.28	.004	*
12.	Social Recognition	I	135	4.99	4.95	.785	
13.	Varied Life	I	135	5.10	4.86	.072	
14.	Wisdom	M	135	5.70	5.88	.136	
15.	Social Justice	M	135	5.07	5.16	.431	
16.	lndependent	I	135	5.61	5.50	.478	
17.	Moderate	C	135	3.55	3.59	.810	
18.	Loyal	C	135	5.71	5.99	.014	*
19.	Ambitious	I	135	5.63	5.79	.113	
20.	Honoring Parents	C	135	5.53	5.82	.001	*
21.	Capable	I	135	5.45	5.54	.341	
22.	Preserving Public Image	I	135	4.31	4.31	1.000	
23.	Enjoying Life	I	135	5.98	5.81	.147	
24.	Devout	C	135	4.16	4.45	.037	*

25.	Curious	I	135	5.03	4.92	.334
26.	Forgiving	C	135	5.24	5.15	.452

Demographic Variable

In regards to the demographic variables, gender was a statistically significant independent variable only in the case of American supposedly living in India in respect to collectivist values with females opting for these values.

Table 7
Americans Living in India
Gender

Individualist Value

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Male	66	5.09	.5227
Female	69	5.01	
Total	135	5.05	

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Male	66	5.03	.0543
Female	69	5.30	
Total	135	5.16	

	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
Male	66	5.25	.8148
Female	69	5.16	
Total	135	5.20	

Television viewing was a significant factor in the case of Americans as American residents in respect to collectivist values with light television viewers supporting these values.

Table 8
Hours Spent Watching Television
Americans in America

Individualist Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.	Sig.
1	40	5.30	.7570	
2	81	5.17		
3	14	5.26		
Total	135	5.2		

Collectivist Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.	Sig.
1	40	5.31	.0477	*
2	81	4.86		
3	14	5.08		
Total	135	5.01		

Mixed Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.	Sig.
1	40	5.29	.2881	
2	81	5.04		
3	14	5.02		
Total	135	5.11		

Group 1 = Less than I hour per day
Group 2 = 2 - 5 hours daily
Group 3 = more than 5 hours daily

Finally, income was a significant factor in the case of Americans supposedly living in India with heavy television viewers opting for mixed values.

Table 9
Family Income
Americans Living in India

Individualist Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	38	5.10	.5687
2	60	4.99	
3	37	5.17	
Total	135	5.07	

Collectivist Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	38	5.02	.0865
2	60	5.11	
3	37	5.43	
Total	135	5.17	

Mixed Value

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	38	3.19	.000 *
2	60	6.19	
3	37	9.00	
Total	135	6.20	

Group 1 = $0- $30,000
Group 2 = $30,000-$80,000
Group 3 = over $80,000

Discussion and Conclusion

The current study had three major objectives: (1) to test the construct validity of the universal structure of values as a measure of intercultural sensitivity, (2) to ascertain whether the value measure has universal application and (3) to assess the extent to which television, income, gender and other independent variable's contribute to one's level of intercultural sensitivity.

As far as values as a measure of intercultural sensitivity, the finding of our study are relatively mixed. The Indian respondents when asked to rate values as Indians predictably opted for collectivist and mixed values. However, when called upon to rate these values as American residents, they did not opt for individualist values as there was no statistically significant difference in their mean score on these values.

American respondents did not prefer individualist values as American residents. Neither did they opt for collectivist values as Indian residents which it was assumed they would prefer. However, when individual items were analyzed, Indians as Indian residents opted decidedly for collectivist values. While their rating of individualist values was not pronounced, The Indian students opted for two individualist values significantly when asked to rate them as American residents. Indians as Indian residents also preferred mixed values as compared to Indians as American.

As for Americans rating these value types as American or Indian residents, the results were not consistent. America s as Indian residents preferred individualist values while as American residents they rated collectivist values higher. On the individualist items, however, Americans scored statistically significantly on individualist items, as American residents and did the same on collectivist values as Indian residents. Both ratings followed the predicted pattern.

Confirmatory factor analysis not only validated the construct structure of values as American and Indians accepted nearly 100% of the value items, but also most of the values were joined together within the collectivist, individualist and mixed types. However, this support for the universal structure of values was qualified, at best, as all value items did not fall into the projected categories of individualism, collectivism and mixed values.

The results of the factor analysis, however, were meaningful in the intercultural sensitivity analysis. When Indians were asked to rate value types as Indian residents, the four factors had a predominantly collectivist/mixed direction. However, when they rated these items as American residents, the majority of the factors had individualist domination. Similarly, when Americans were asked to rate values as American residents, they opted for individualist items. When called upon to sort as Indian residents, they preferred collectivist items. At no point are we are suggesting that this pattern is unmistakably clear. At best we are suggesting some tendencies which need further investigation.

Demographic variables do not seem to have a consistent direction in contributing to preference for value types. However, they need, particularly television viewing, a second look. Findings on television and value preference have been inconsistent. A study, for example found that television viewing by American students does not contribute to differences in their values preference. But authors point out 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 and 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 and does so in a limited way in a primarily collectivist country like India. Is it possible that Americans have been exposed to television for such a long time that the desensitization process has set in whereas Indian students for whom American television programs are a novelty – are eager to embrace the individualist values perpetuated by the American fare? (Kapoor, Wolfe and Blue, 1995).

Recently individualism - collectivism has come under close scrutiny. Schwartz (1990, p. 151) has noted, the dichotomy first:

> leads us to overlook values that inherently serve both individual and collectivist interests. Second, the dichotomy ignores values that foster the goals of collectivist other than the in-group (e.g., pro-social values). Third, the dichotomy promotes the mistaken assumption that individualist and collectivist values each form coherent syndromes that are opposed to one another. It fails to recognize that the subtypes of individualist and collectivist values sometimes do not vary together and are sometimes not opposed. Triandis, whose work has employed the dichotomy, recently noted that all humans are both individualistic and collectivist. "Individualism and collectivism can coexist and simply emphasize a culture depending upon the situation" (1993: 162). Schwartz (1990) stresses the need for refining these concepts and the instruments formulated to measure them. Gudykunst, *et al.* (1992) suggest that relational and personality factors moderate the influence of individualism and collectivism on in-group and out-group communication.

Some researchers like Triandis and others have suggested that these inadequacies may be removed if future researchers include the vertical and horizontal dimensions in their studies of diverse cultures. As Singelis *et al.* (1995) suggests:

> 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. These distinctions may prove useful, especially when examining the sources and management of social, political and interpersonal conflicts. Because the seeds of conflict can often be traced to competition for scarce resources, the way people perceive, accept and manage inequality will no doubt influence the frequency, intensity and communications of conflict.

In conclusion, values as a measure of intercultural sensitivity appears to provide a lot of potential, provided refinements to the individualism-collectivism typology are completed.

Finally, a note of caution to researchers who might use Schwartz's 56 items value instrument for measuring intercultural sensitivity: it is almost impossible to ask respondents to complete the questionnaire twice, once as themselves and a second time as residents of the other culture being studied. There also is a need to shorten the instrument. If they do , as we did, it is important to ensure when selecting the value items all domains specified by Schwartz are included. We failed to do so. Perhaps this omission may have been responsible for the mixed results of this study.

References

Bhawuk, D. P. S. and Brislin, R.
1992 The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 413-36.

Gudykunst, W., Gao, G., Schmidt, K., Nishida, T., Bond, M., Wang, G. and Barraclough, R.
1990 The influence of individualism-collectivism, self-monitoring, and predicted -outcome value on communication in in-group and out-group relationships. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *23*, 196-213.

Hofstede, G.
1980 *Culture's consequence: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hui, C. & Triandis, H.
1986 Individualism - collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *17*, 225-48.

Kang, J., Kapoor, S. and Wolfe, A.
1995 The impact of television viewing on the values orientations of Indian students: an Individualist - Collectivist approach. *Howard Journal of Communication*, *6 (3)*, 188-205.

Kapoor, S., Wolfe, A. and Blue, J.
1995 Universal values structure and Individualism - Collectivism: A U.S. test. *Communication Research Reports*, *23*, 112 - 23.

Kapoor, S. and Comadena, M.
1996 Intercultural Sensitivity in individualist-collectivist setting. Paper presented at Intercultural Communication Convention, Albuquerque, NM.

Rokeach, M.
1973 *The nature of human values*. Free Press: New York.

Schwartz, S.
1990 Individualism - collectivism critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 139-57.
1992 Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical advances in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, (pp. 1-66).

Schwartz, S. & Bilsky, W.
1987 Toward a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 396-404.

1990 Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 872-91.

Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H., Bwahuk, D. P. S. and Gelfrand, M. J.
1995 Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29, 240-75.

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

Triandis, H., Leung, K., Villareal, M., Clark, F.
1985 Allocentric vs. Idiocentric tendencies: convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research and Personality, 19*, 395-415.

Triandis, H., Botempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, M. and Monmlooin, G.
1986 The measurement of etix aspects of Individualism and Collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 38*, 257-67.

Triandis, H., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M., Asai, M., & Lucas, N.
1988 Individualism and Collectivism: Cross - cultural perspectives on self in group relationships. *Journal of Research and Personality, 19*, 395-415.

Appendix 1

	Variable	Value Type
1.	Equality	Mixed
2.	Social Power	Individualist
3.	Pleasure	Individualist
4.	Spiritual Life	Mixed
5.	Sense of Belonging	Mixed
6.	Exciting Life	Individualist
7.	Politeness	Collectivist
8.	Creativity	Individualist
9.	Mature Love	Collectivist
10.	Detachment	Mixed
11.	Family Security	Mixed
12.	Social Recognition	Individualist
13.	Varied Life	Individualist
14.	Wisdom	Mixed
15.	Social Justice	Mixed
16.	Independent	Individualist
17.	Moderate	Collectivist
18.	Loyal	Collectivist
19.	Ambitious	Individualist
20.	Honoring of Parents of Elders	Collectivist
21.	Capable	Individualist
22.	Preserving of One's Public Image	Individualist
23.	Enjoying Life	Individualist
24.	Devout	Collectivist
25.	Curious	Individualist
26.	Forgiving	Collectivist