Intercultural Sensitivity: A Comparison of American and Japanese Value Preference

Suraj Kapoor
Illinois State University

Janet Blue
Illinois State University

Catherine Konsky
Illinois State University

Michael Drager
Illinois State University

Abstract

This study examined the feasibility of using the Schwartz and Bilsky measures of universal values to assess intercultural sensitivity in an individualist-collectivist setting. Using a modified form of their measures, American and Japanese students rated 28 values first as residents of their home country and then as if they were residents of the other country. Results revealed a possible flaw in the selection of the 28 value items. Respondents found it difficult to perceive what life may be like in another country

Rationale

While intercultural sensitivity has considerable theoretical significance for the study of intercultural communication, researchers have failed to develop sound measures of the construct. This shortcoming stems from the fact that researchers have failed to adequately specify the range of behaviors that reflect 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) tested the construct validity of the Bhawuk and Brislin 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 (1990) measure of universal values in individualist-collectivist setting in an attempt to explore its validity in assessing intercultural sensitivity. More specifically, this study used universal value structure measures in both individualist6 (U.S) and collectivist (Japanese) cultures to test the universal application of the measure. In

addition, the study explored the role of mass media in perpetuating intercultural sensitivity.

Intercultural Sensitivity

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 (Klineberg & Hull, 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 (ICSI), 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 appropriately and successfully modify their behavior 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.

The Individualism-Collectivism Construct

Values serve the interest of individuals and groups. Values that sever individual interests are postulated to be opposed to those that serve collective ones. This postulate undergirds the theory of individualism-collectivism as develop by Triandis (1993) and others (Hui & Triandis, 1986; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucas, 1988; Triandis, Leung, Villareal & Clark, 1985; Triandis et. al., 1986). "Societies vary substantially in the emphasis their members five individualistic values versus collectivist" ones (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990, p. 879). 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 if rather ineffective in assessing "other" culture's typical behavior pattern. They indicate that both American and Mexican students, when called upon to evaluate other cultures' 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 consistent 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 is rectify this deficiency is to substitute the items used by Bhawuk & Brislin (1992) with value items as developed by Schwartz and Bilsky (1990). 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 results.

Universal Value Structure

In the Schwartz and Bilsky(1987, 1990) studies, Rokeach's (1973) value scale, 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 distinct value types. These value types included nomenclature, pro-social, restrictive conformity, enjoyment, achievement, maturity, self-direction, and security. In 1992, Schwartz modified this taxonomy by specifying 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 sample studies 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" 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 (Japan) 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, there has been limited research conducted on the role television plays in the development and perpetuating of intercultural sensitivity. Television is a very powerful medium and may have profound effect on levels of viewers' intercultural sensitivity. Specifically, we seek answers to the following research questions:

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

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 that 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.

Method

A self-administered questionnaire, written in the English language, was distributed in the spring, 1998 to 233 American college students attending a large Mid-western university in the United States. The same self-administered questionnaire, again written in the English language, was administered in the spring, 1998 to 247 Japanese college students attending a university in Japan.

The questionnaire contained a modified version of the 28-item value scale developed by Schwartz's and Bilsky (1990), along with detailed questions on media habits, income level, religion and political beliefs.

The survey was conducted in classes over a period of one week. Instructors (professors) were provided complete instructions by the authors to answer questions raised by the respondents.

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on 28-item value scale. 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:

Americans Living in American

1. Individualist: Thirteen indices that measure the respondents' orientation with respect to individualistic values include ten (2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 28) individualist values, one (20) collectivist value and two (5 and 16) mixed values with an alpha value of .78.
2. Collectivist: Six indices measure the respondents' orientation (7, 9, 13, 14, 15 and 25) with respect to collectivist values with an alpha value of .70.
3. Mixed: Five indices which measure the respondents' mixed values consist of three mixed (1, 4, and 26) and one collectivist (23) value and one (27) individualist value with an alpha value of .60.

Americans Living in Japan

1. Individualist: Seven indices, which measure the respondents' values, include five (38, 40, 42, 56 and 60) individualist values and two (37 and 58) mixed values with an alpha value of .70.
2. Collectivist: Nine indices, which measure the subjects' collectivist values, include six (45, 46, 47, 52, 55 and 57) collectivist, two mixed (36 and 48) values and one (51) individualist value with an alpha value of .75.
3. Mixed: Four indices, which assess the respondents' values, include three (33, 43 and 44) mixed values and one (42) individualist value with an alpha of .38. (See Appendix 1)

Japanese Living in Japan

1 Individualist: Nine indices (all of which were individualist values) measure the Japanese respondent's values. The nine values represented are: 2, 6, 8, 10, 21, 22, and 24, 27 and 28 with an alpha value of .75.
2. Collectivist: Nine indices (5,7,12,13,14,15,18,20 and 23) were included in this factor with an alpha value of .70.
3. Mixed: Six indices, which assess the subject's values, include five mixed values (4,11,16,17, and 26) and one (9) collectivist value with an alpha value of .49.

Japanese Living in United States

1. Individualist: Eleven indices, which assess the respondents values include (34,35,38,40,42,51,53,54,56,59 and 60), with one value being mixed (36) with an alpha value of .81.
2. Collectivist: Six indices measure respondent's values that include (34, 42, 53, 54, 55 and 60) with an alpha value of .63.
3. Mixed: Five indices, which measure respondents' values, include (33, 43, 48, 49 and 58) with an alpha value of .55. (See Appendix 1)

Analysis was performed to determine if participants' television viewing patterns were related to their value preferences. The series of questions about television viewing very detailed. There were questions concerning viewing habits during the week, as well as types of programming viewed. Analysis was partitioned into light (less than 2 hours daily), moderate (2 to 5 hours daily), and heavy (more than 5 hours daily), television viewing. The relationship between income and value orientation was also examined.

Results

American sample

Mean Comparison: t-tests for paired samples were computed to compare American samples' responses on individualist, collectivist and mixed values as they would rate while residing in Japan and in the United States. The results indicated only one category responses had statistically significant differences with respect to collectivist value types. With regard to the collectivist value types, Americans respondents tended to offer more collectivist while rating those as residents in living in Japan compared to as United States residents.

Table I
t-Test for Paired Sample Variables: American S4MPle

	Value	Means	Significance (2-tailed)
	Living in U.S.	Living in Japan	
Equality	5.80	5.68	.276
Social Power	3.01	4.30	.000
Pleasure	5.41	5.50	.001
Spiritual Life	4.74	5.15	.000
Sense of Belonging	5.31	5.37	.624
An Exciting Life	5.48	5.09	.000
Politeness	5.45	5.79	.002
Creativity	5.57	5.00	.000
Mature Love	5.88	5.42	.000
Successful	6.06	6.04	.845
Detachment	3.23	3.77	.000
Family Security	6.51	6.24	.000
Humble	4.89	5.33	.000
Respect for Tradition	4.13	5.56	.000
Obedience	3.86	4.94	.000
Wisdom	5.73	5.80	.419
Social Justice	5.38	5.23	.138
Loyal	6.04	5.87	.033
Ambitious	5.75	5.93	.061
Honoring of Parents And Elders	5.87	6.19	.001
Capable	5.55	5.63	.339
Preserving Public Image	4.48	5.12	.000
Devout	4.54	5.00	.000
Curious	4.98	4.88	.404
Forgiving	5.19	5.19	1.00
World at Peace	5.46	5.40	.598
Self Respect	6.15	5.75	.000
Social Recognition	4.64	5.24	.000

When t-tests were conducted for the 28 items separately, on seventeen value statements, the respondents differed statistically significantly. Out of seven (2, 3, 6, 8, 22, 27 and 28) statistically significant individualist items. Americans as Japanese residents have higher means on four and lower means on the remaining three indices. Thus on this value types, there is no clear-cut pattern. All of the seven (7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 20 and 23) statistically significant collectivist statements have higher means for Americans as Japanese residents as compared to heir perceptions as

American residents. Similarly of the three (4, 11 and 12) statistically significant mixed value type statements, American again rated the two with the highest means as if they were Japanese residents. 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 Americans living in Japan as well as living in the United States. The results show that the two sets of responses had statistically significant differences with respect to only collectivist value types. In the case of these collectivist values, American as Japanese residents perceive themselves as more supporting that value type than Americans residing in the United States.

Table 2
t-test for Paired Samples: American Study

Individualist Values

	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significant (2-tailed)
American in America	224	5.10	.041
American in Japan		5.19	

Collectivist Values

	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significant (2-tailed)
American in America	227	5.10	.000*
American in Japan		5.47	

Mixed Values

	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significant (2-tailed)
American in America	225	5.36	.250
American in Japan		5.41	

Japanese Sample

Mean Comparisons. T-tests for paired samples were computed to compare Japanese samples' responses on individualist, collectivist and mixed values as they would rate while residing in Japan and in the United States. The results indicated only one category of responses had statistically significant differences with respect to individualist value types. With regard to the individualist value types, Japanese

respondents tended to offer more individualist rating as if they were residents living in the United States compared to Japanese residents.

Table 3
t-test for Paired Sample Variables: Japanese Sample

	Value	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
	Living in Japan	Living in the U, S.	
Equality	4.59	5.62	.000
Social Power	3.89	5.00	.000
Pleasure	6.12	5.88	.001
Spiritual Life	5.45	5.30	.122
Sense of Belonging	3.74	3.67	.575
An Exciting Life	5.06	5.45	.000
Politeness	4.85	4.16	.000
Creativity	5.20	5.68	.000
Mature Love	5.52	5.35	.064
Successful	5.01	5.68	.000
Detachment	3.98	4.38	.002
Family Security	5.76	6.06	.001
Humble	4.38	3.70	.000
Respect for Tradition	3.57	3.40	.192
Obedience	3.28	3.50	.054
Wisdom	5.26	5.30	.702
Social Justice	4.96	5.31	.002
Loyal	5.13	5.20	.446
Ambitious	5.37	5.63	.007
Honoring of Parents And Elders	4.62	4.71	.370
Capable	4.77	4.71	.370
Preserving Public Image	3.95	4.38	.000
Devout	2.31	3.70	.000
Curious	5.36	5.51	.048
Forgiving	5.15	4.64	.000
World at Peace	4.98	5.23	.014
Self Respect	5.04	5.51	.000
Social Recognition	4.58	5.20	.000

When t-tests were conducted for the 28 items separately, on sixteen value statements, the respondents differed statistically significantly. Out of eight (2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 22, 27 and 28) statistically significant individualist items, Japanese as American residents have higher means on six of the eight mean values and lower means on the remaining two indices. Therefore, on this value types, Japanese, when perceiving themselves as living as an American clearly preferred the individualist value type. Of the four (8, 13, 23 and 25)

statistically significant collectivist statements, there was an even split between high and low value means between Japanese as American residents and Japanese as Japanese residents. Japanese residents. However, of the four (1, 11, 12 and 17) statistically significant mixed value items, Japanese as American residents overwhelmingly preferred mixed value types.

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

Table 4
t-test for Paired Samples: Japanese Sample

Individualist Values

	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
Japanese in Japan	246	4.95	.000
Japanese in America		5.41	

Collectivist Values

	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
Japanese in Japan	247	4.31	.333
Japan in America		4.26	

Mixed Values

	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
Japanese in Japan	246	4.84	.000
Japanese in America		5.11	

Television Viewing

Americans living as United States residents, who self reported themselves as being heavy television viewers opted for more mixed values as demonstrated by a slightly higher means average differences between that group and medium and light

viewing respondents for that value type. On individualist and collectivist value types, there were no significant differences.

Table 5
Americans Living in the United States: Hours Watching Television

Individualist Values

Group	Respondents (N)	Mean	Significance
1	55	4.99	.144
2	162	5.13	
3	13	5.40	

Collectivist Values

Group	Respondents	Mean	Significance
1	55	5.18	.243
2	162	5.07	
3	13	5.47	

Mixed Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
1	55	5.35	.089
2	162	5.34	
3	13	5.77	

- For Tables 5-8:
  Group 1 = Less than 2 hours viewing per day
  Group 2 = 2 - 5 hours viewing per day
  Group 3 = More than 5 hours viewing per day

Americans living as if they were in Japan, reported similar preference for the mixed value type among heavy television viewers when compared to the other two groups. As with the Americans as United States residents, heavy television viewers opted for more individualist value when compared to the same viewing group and collectivist values.

Table 6
Americans Living In Japan: Hours Watching Television

Individualist Values

Group	Respondents	Mean	Significance
1	53	5.10	.015
2	156	5.15	
3	12	5.85	

Collectivist Values

Group	Respondents	Mean	Significance
1	54	5.55	.429
2	158	5.43	
3	12	5.71	

Mixed Values

Group	Respondents	Mean	Significance
1	53	5.32	.069
2	157	5.39	
3	12	5.87	

For Japanese living in Japan, television viewing was not a significant factor in value rating. Heavy television viewers opted for more individualist values compared to the same group who reported collectivist and mixed value types.

Table 7
Japanese Living in Japan: Hours Watching Television

Individualist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
1	128	4.86	.689
2	115	5.0-3	
3	3	5.21	

Collectivist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
1	129	4.30	.737
2	115	4.32	
3	3	4.59	

Mixed Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
1	129	4.82	.945
2	114	4.87	
3	3	4.75	

Responses for Japanese living as residents of the United States did not reveal any statistically significant differences. However, the groups with the highest means were those individuals who viewed television between 2-5 hours daily. This group preferred individualist value types.

Table 8
Japanese Living in the United States: Hours Watching Television

Individualist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
1	129	5.30	.836
2	115	5.54	
3	3	5.30	

Collectivist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
1	129	4.21	.871
2	115	4.32	
3	3	4.07	

Mixed Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	Significance (2-tailed)
1	129	5.02	.877
2	115	5.21	
3	3	5.00	

Family Income

Family income had so significantly statistically impact in reference to preferred value types for either the American or Japanese study.

Table 9
Family Income: American Study

Individualist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	74	5.21	.514
2	113	5.02	
3	18	5.13	

Collectivist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	74	5.19	.774
2	113	5.06	
3	18	5.20	

Mixed Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	74	5.46	.517
2	113	5.28	
3	18	5.39	

*Income categories equivalent to U.S. currency values for Table 9-10.
Group 1 = Less than $30,000 per year
Group 2 = 30,001 to $80,000 per year
Group 3 = Over $80,001 per year

Table 10

Family Income: Japanese Study

Individualist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob,
1	13	5.27	.056
2	168	5.00	
3	65	4.75	

Collectivist Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	13	4.60	.140
2	169	4.33	
3	65	4.2	

Mixed Values

Group	Number of Respondents	Mean	F. Prob.
1	13	4.95	.834
2	169	4.83	
3	64	4.85	

Discussion and Conclusions

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 Japanese respondents when asked to rate values as Japanese 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 Japanese residents, which it was assumed they would prefer. However, when individual items were analyzed, Japanese as Japanese 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. Japanese as Japanese residents also preferred mixed values as compared to Japanese as Americans.

As for American rating these value types as American or Japanese residents, the results were not consistent. Americans as Japanese 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 Japanese residents. Both ratings followed the predicted pattern.

Confirmatory factor analysis not only validate the construct structure of values as American and Japanese 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 Japanese were asked to rate value types as Japanese 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 Japanese residents, they preferred collectivist items. At no point are we 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 contribution to preference for value types. However, we need to give, 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 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 Japanese 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 server 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 individualist 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 refining these concepts and the instruments formulated to measure them. Gudykunst (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.

Appendix I

Value	**Value Types**
1. Equality	Mixed
2. Social Power	Individualist
3. Pleasure	Individualist
4. Spiritual Life	Mixed

5. Sense of Belonging	Mixed
6. An Exciting Life	Individualist
7. Politeness	Collectivist
8. Creativity	Individualist
9. Mature Love	Collectivist
10. Successful	Individualist
11. Detachment	Mixed
12. Family Security	Mixed
13. Humble	Collectivist
14. Respect for Tradition	Collectivist
15. Obedience	Collectivist
16. Wisdom	Mixed
17. Social Justice	Mixed
18. Loyal	Collectivist
19. Ambitious	Individualist
20. Honoring Parents and Elders	Collectivist
21. Capable	Individualist
22. Preserving Public Image	Individualist
23. Devout	Collectivist
24. Curious	Individualist
25. Forgiving	Collectivist
26. World at Peace	Mixed
27. Respect	Individualist
28. Social Recognition	Individualist

References

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16*, 413-436.

Brislin, R. (1981). *Cross-Cultural Encounters: Face-to-Face Interaction*. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon.

Cleveland, H., Mangone, G., & Adams, J. (1960). *The overseas American*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Frankenstein, J., & Mossini, H. (1988). *Getting ready for East-Asia: Preliminary Notes from China and Japan*. A paper presented at the International Symposium on Pacific Asian Business, Honolulu, HI.

Gudyknust, W., & Kim, Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to Intercultural Communication*. REAding, MA:Addison-Wesley.

Gudyknust, 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). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Hui, C. H. & Triandis, H.C. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17*, 225-248.
Kang, J., Kapoor, S. & Wolfe, A. (1995). The impact of television viewing on the values orientations of Indian students: an individualist-collectivist approach. *Howard Journal of Communications, 6(3)*, 188-205.
Kapoor, S., & Comadena, M. (1996). *Intercultural sensitivity in individualist-collectivist setting*. Paper presented at Intercultural Communication Convention, Albuquerque, NM.
Kapoor, S., Wolfe, A., & Blue, J. (1995). Universal values structure and
individualism-collectivism: A U.S. test. *Communication Research Reports, 23*, 112-123.
Klineberg, O., & Hull, F. (1979). *At a foreign university*. New York:Praeger.
Paige, M. (Ed.). (1986). *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications*. Lanham:MD:Univeristy Press of America.
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.
Schwartz, S. (1990). Individualism-collectivism critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*, 39-157.
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*, 872-891.
Schwartz, S., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 550-562.
Singelis, T.M., Triandis, H., 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*, 240-275.
Triandis, H. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cultural Research, 27*, 155-180.
Triandis, H., 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., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A.,
Georgas, J., Hui, C., Mann, C., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J.B.P., Berma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, M., & deMontmollin, C. (1986). The measurement of ethic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 38*, 257-267.

Triandis, H., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clark, F. (1985). Allocentric vs idiocentric tendencies: convergent and discriminate validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *19*, 395-415.