

Variations of Individualism and Collectivism Within Individuals: The Effects of Value Orientations Towards Family, Friends and Work

Nguyen Huu An*

Abstract: Individualism-Collectivism is a commonly used dimension in comparative cultural studies. The performance of individualism and collectivism has been found diverse at different levels of analysis. While the constructs are seen as opposite poles of a bipolar dimension at the national level, they are demonstrated as independent concepts at the individual level. Recent debates have suggested these constructs should be treated as individual states in relation to social contexts rather than individual traits at the individual level of analysis. This perspective allows us to explain possibilities for any individual to have both individualistic and collectivistic attitudes. Based on the data of three latest waves of World Values Survey, this paper tests the variations of individualism and collectivism at the individual level under effects of value orientations toward key social relations that individuals involved in, namely family, friends and work. Furthermore, the differences in the effects between the “West” and the “East” and how it changes over time are also taken into account. The findings show that individualism is emphasized among individuals who place work as important, which is stronger in the “West” than in the “East” but not clear over time. Collectivism is favored among individuals who consider family and friends significant, and these links are found stronger in the “East” than in the “West”. Especially, individuals’ preference for the value towards family has negative effects on individualism but positive impact on collectivism and these links are evident over the three waves.

Keywords: Comparative Cultural Studies; Individualism; Collectivism; Social Values.

Received 17th October 2017; Revised 27th March 2018; Accepted 30th April 2018

1. Introduction

Cross-national studies on differences in cultures have a long history. Several authors have attempted to clarify cultural distinctions among cultures, especially between the “West” and the “East” through conceptualizing dual constructs containing two opposite poles. Individualism (IND) - Collectivism (COL) is a commonly used dimension in cross-cultural research from

which many scholars from various disciplines detect to what extent the differences between the two worlds are through empirical studies. The performance of IND and COL has been found diverse at different levels of analysis.

At the national (cultural) level, IND and COL are treated as opposite poles on a unidimensional continuum or a bipolar dimension. A culture with strong individualistic attitudes possesses weak collectivistic attitudes, as a result, a person in a highly individualistic culture holds a high individualistic sense and vice versa

* Hue University of Sciences; email: annguyen@husc.edu.vn

(Hofstede, 1980). Analyses at the individual level have found IND and COL varied within countries as well as individuals, which depend on individual characteristics. Individualist traits have typically been linked to masculinity, while collectivist characteristics have been associated with femininity (Green et al. 2005). Besides, ethnicity has been considered a factor determining the variations of IND and COL within a country (Green et al. 2005). A Hispanic group was demonstrated to hold more collectivist sense than samples of Northern and Western European backgrounds in context of the United States (Triandis 1989). In terms of region, people in urban regions tend to be individualistic, while traditional-rural people have shown more COL within the same culture (Triandis 1989). Generations have been paid attention, which the younger have been shown to be more autonomous and independent than the older (Green et al. 2005). Social class is an important foundation in which many findings show that people occupying higher classes are frequently inclined to be more individualist than people located at lower classes (Green et al. 2005).

Kim and Coleman (2015) proposed a new approach to examine how IND-COL dimension vary within individuals, in which states rather than traits are seen as factors of the variations. These authors argued that because an individual can be high on both or low on both, treating IND and COL as individual traits results in inadequate explanations. When considered as states, the variations of IND and COL within individuals are assumed to mainly rest on social contexts or social relations in which individuals perform social interactions. Exposing individualistic or collectivistic values depends on kinds of social relations, in which one may carry IND when

interacting with colleagues and collectivism when being in family or friend relation.

The theoretical assumption of Kim and Coleman (2015) leads to a suggestion about how IND and COL can be explained by the degree to which individuals emphasize value orientations toward social relations that individuals take part in. Based on data from three latest waves of World Values Survey (WVS), this paper will take this theoretical implication to test how individual preference to IND and COL would be affected by value orientations towards family, friends, and work that still gains relatively little attention in the literature. Besides, the effects will be detected in comparison among cultures, specifically between the “West” and the “East”, and how it changes over time. Connotation of the “West” and the “East” is implicated in Nisbett’s works (2010), in which the “East” is representative of East Asian countries carrying cultural background influenced by Confucianism; while its counterpart - the “West” - is the countries which are of similar characteristics of European culture mirroring the Greek civilization. The two country groups are purposively selected for the analysis of the paper. The West consists of United States, West Germany, and Norway, the East includes Vietnam, Taiwan, and Japan is chosen to be representative.

2. Theoretical discussions

2.1. IND and COL

The term IND and COL were first introduced by Hofstede (1980) and used to describe the characteristics of a culture. Since then these concepts have been widely used to explain differences in the ways people think and act in the “West” and the “East” (Kim & Coleman 2015). Tracing

back to the history of sociology, the contrast between individual and collective implication was early discussed. Emile Durkheim distinguished between organic solidarity and mechanical solidarity. While the former focuses on the individualistic dimension which implies relations of dissimilar individuals, the latter presents the collectivistic aspect emphasizing the bonds of similar people in a society (Oyserman et al. 2002: 3). Max Weber, in turn, differentiated “*individual-focused Western European Protestantism*” as preferring self-reliance and pursuit of personal interests with “*collective-focused Catholicism*” as favoring permanent and hierarchical relationships (Oyserman et al. 2002: 3). Also in this respect, Tönnies developed the term “*Gemeinschaft to imply the community-focused relationships of small villages in order to contrast with the term Gesellschaft that emphasizes the association-based relationships of urban societies*” (Oyserman et al. 2002: 3).

Hofstede (1980) views IND as a “*focus on rights above duties, a concern for oneself and immediate family, an emphasis on personal autonomy and self-fulfillment, and basing identity on one’s personal accomplishments*” (Oyserman et al. 2002:4). Oyserman et al. (2002: 5) clarified four psychological consequences of IND, namely self-concept, well-being, attribution style, and relationality. Regarding self-concept, IND denotes that (a) creating and maintaining a positive sense of self is a basic human endeavor; (b) feeling good about oneself, personal success and (c) having many unique or distinctive personal attitudes and opinions are valued (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). In relation to well-being, IND is shown as “*related to open emotional expression and attainment of one’s personal goals which are important sources of well-*

being and life satisfaction” (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). With regard to attribution style, IND hints at the meaning that “*judgment, reasoning, and causal inference are generally oriented toward the person rather than the situation or social context because the decontextualized self is assumed to be a stable, causal nexus*” (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). Finally, regarding the relationality component, IND is referred as “*somewhat ambivalent stance. Individuals need relationships and group memberships to attain self-relevant goals, but relationships are costly to maintain... Individualists balance relationships’ costs and benefits, leaving relationships and groups when the costs of participation exceed the benefits and creating new relationships as personal goals shift; as a result, relationships and group memberships are impermanent and non-intensive*” (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5).

COL, as opposed to IND, is assumed in the sense that individuals are bound and mutually obligated by groups (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). Collectivist societies are constructed by social units with a common fate and common goals and the person is just a component of the social, making the in-group crucial (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). Similar to IND, Oyserman et al. (2002) identified psychological consequences of COL as follows. Firstly, regarding self-concept, COL contains the following characteristics: (a) group membership is a central aspect of identity; (b) valued personal traits reflect the goals of collectivism (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). Secondly, with respect to well-being, COL contains two dimensions including (a) life satisfaction derives from successfully carrying out social roles and obligations and (b) restraint in emotional expression is valued to ensure in-group harmony (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). Thirdly, in terms

of attribution style, COL stresses on social context and social roles in perceptions and causal reasoning and contextualizes meaning (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5). And finally, in COL point of view of relationality, important group memberships are seen as fixed “facts of life” to which people must accommodate; boundaries between in-groups and out-groups are stable, relatively impermeable, and important; and in-group exchanges are based on equality or even generosity principles (Oyserman et al. 2002: 5).

2.2. IND versus COL at the cultural level

At the cultural level, Hofstede (1980) found IND and COL as opposite poles on a unidimensional continuum. A culture with high individualistic values holds weak collectivistic sense, and thus, a person in a strong individualistic culture emphasizes high individualistic sense and vice versa. Hofstede (1980) showed that affluent Western countries were high in IND and developing countries were high in COL.

Several scholars have employed Hofstede’s perspective to formulate IND and COL as two opposite concepts to demonstrate cultural differences between the “West” – European American and the “non-West” – East Asian in cross-cultural studies. On this light the common findings from those studies show that the “West” holds more individualistic sense, while the “non-West”, more specifically the East Asian, tend to prefer collectivistic sense (Shweder & Bourne 1984; Triandis 1989; Markus & Kitayama 1991; Nisbett et al. 2001; Maznevski et al. 2002; Lu et al., 2001). Chinese people and those who share the same cultural background from East Asia

see themselves as part of a larger group and place a high priority on their in-groups (Chan 1963; Triandis 1990; Trompenaars 1993; Tong 1991 in Tjosvold et al. 2003). People with individualistic values, common in the US and other Western countries, are shown as preferring to be autonomous and discuss conflicting ideas openly and directly through dignifying the self-expression (Tjosvold et al. 2003).

2.3. The variations of IND and COL at the individual level of analysis

At the individual level, IND and COL are considered as social values because “*they are deemed desirable and reflect something durable and trans-situations by the members of a specific group, thus, they are different from attitudes, opinion, and preference*” (Yoon 2010: 58). While IND and COL are seen as opposite poles of a unidimensional continuum at the national level, the two constructs have been found to be independent to each other at the individual level of analysis. Gelfand and colleagues (1996) demonstrated that, at individual-level, IND and COL are perceived as orthogonal constructs. Their findings showed that “*an individual can be high or low in both, or high on one and low on the other*” (Gelfand et al 1996: 407). There are individualists and collectivists in every society, simply as a result of differing environmental influences and/or predispositions. They also claimed that this result is also in line with research on cognitive structures that found “*people generally sample from separate collective and independent cognitive structures depending on the situation*” (Gelfand et al 1996: 407). This perspective is recognized as similar to the idea of ‘bicultural’

worldviews in multicultural societies that includes elements of both IND and COL (Gelfand et al 1996: 407). The author also suggested that researchers should take this dimensionality into account in their conceptualizations, measurements, and analysis of IND and COL (Gelfand et al. 1996). Markus and Kitayama (1991) have the same view that individuals are different in the way they view themselves as either being separate from or connected to their social environment (e.g. interdependent self-construal versus interdependent self-construal).

The arguments which IND and COL involve have two unipolar dimensions, Triandis and colleagues identified horizontal and vertical as two orthogonal subtypes of IND and COL (Kim & Coleman 2015: 141). *“The most important attributes of IND and COL are the horizontal and vertical aspects of social relations - referring to the extent of equality versus hierarchy in one’s social relationships”* (Kim & Coleman 2015: 141). These assumptions have received empirical support through cross-cultural studies. For example, the difference in horizontal-vertical IND between American or British and Swedish or Danish is similar to the distinction in the horizontal-vertical COL between Korean or Japanese and the Israeli kibbutz (Shavitt et al. 2010: 3). In vertical-individualist societies such as U.S, Great Britain, France, individuals have a propensity towards enhancing their own status distinguishing themselves from others via competition, achievement, and power (Shavitt et al. 2010: 3). Conversely, horizontal-individualist societies such as Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Australia include individuals who see themselves as equal to others in status (Shavitt et al. 2010: 3). In vertical-collectivist societies (Korea, Japan, India), people tend to obey

authorities and to improve the cohesion and status of their in-groups (Shavitt et al. 2010: 4). In horizontal-collectivist societies with the example of the Israeli kibbutz, sociability and interdependence with others are the center of social relations, in which an egalitarian framework is highly emphasized (Shavitt et al. 2010: 4).

Shavitt et al. (2010) pointed out evidence from empirical studies of differences within individualist societies as well as collective societies. For instance, in societies characterized as horizontal-IND, Scandinavians and Australians have been demonstrated to favor the virtues of modesty instead desiring to be successful persons (Shavitt et al. 2010: 4). In contrast, in a society with vertical IND, people in the U.S. have been shown to aspire to distinction, achievement and being “the best” (Shavitt et al. 2010: 4). Similarly, although collectivists share an interdependent worldview, different from the Israeli kibbutz (horizontal COL) who tend to prefer honesty, directness, and cooperation within a framework of assumed equality, Koreans and other East Asians (vertical-COL) show *“deference to authority and preservation of harmony in the context of hierarchical relations with others”* (Shavitt et al. 2010: 4).

2.4. Aims of the Present Study

The aforementioned models were criticized for exposing limitations to examine variations of IND-COL within individuals. Kim and Coleman (2015: 141) stated that *“...the crossing of IND and COL with horizontal and vertical aspects of social relations (equality versus hierarchy) [...] remains unclear into which of the four categories a person with both high individualistic and high collectivistic attitudes would fall”*. Thus, possibilities for any individual to have both individualistic

and collectivistic attitudes when interacting with reference groups were not mentioned (Kim and Coleman 2015). One may have an individualistic orientation when interacting with his co-workers but tend to be collectivistic when interacting with his family members. Accordingly, this hypothesis is at odds with the two-dimensional, unipolar model of IND-COL (Kim & Coleman 2015). Instead of considering IND and COL as traits, Kim and Coleman (2015) proposed a new approach of which focus is on states. This perspective places the variations of IND-COL within individuals depending on social contexts or social relations that individuals take part in.

Taking the critical view into account, this paper aims at exploring how IND and COL can be explained by the degree to which individuals emphasize value orientations toward key social relations that individuals involve, namely family, friends and work, and how the effects of those value orientations on IND and COL vary between the “West” and the “East”. Furthermore, this study also detects how the effects change over time.

IND has been theorized to be greater in working environment or relationships, while COL has been put forward to be favored in family and friend interactions. Accordingly, it is assumed that individuals who see work as important to them tend to be more individualistic. Similarly, individuals who place family and friend important to them are inclined to be more collectivistic.

3. Data and methodology

3.1. Data

This paper primarily draws on the three latest waves (fourth, fifth and sixth) of data from the WVS which has been widely used in academic studies so far. There are six waves carried out from 1981 to 2014. Each wave has been implemented in approximately every five years, with an average sample size of 1,400 respondents who are eighteen and over per each country (Yoon 2010: 57). The fourth wave was carried out in 1999-2004 for 62 countries. In 2005-2009, the fifth wave was done for 57 countries, and the latest (sixth) wave was implemented in 2010-2014 for 60 countries (Yoon 2010: 57).

The empirical analysis of this paper relies on the data from six countries in which three are randomly selected in the block of which cultural legacy is Confucian (called as the “East”), the others also randomly chosen in the blocks following Greece culture (call as the “West”). The “West” is represented by the United State, West Germany, and Norway. The “East” includes Japan, Taiwan, and Vietnam. In the fourth wave, West Germany, Norway and Taiwan were not surveyed, while, in the sixth wave, Norway and Vietnam were also not included. The sample size for the analysis is specified in the table below:

Table 1: Sample size of the study

Countries	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6
United States	1200	1249	2232
West Germany	-	988	1034
Norway	-	1025	-
Japan	1362	1096	2443
Taiwan	-	1227	1238
Viet Nam	1000	1495	-
Total	3562	7080	6947

Most of the studies examining cultural differences on the dimension of IND and COL are psychological experiments, which are cross-national comparisons that examine individual-level effects and typically involve convenience samples of college students, many of them participate in the study while attending a psychology course (Yoon 2010). These kinds of experiments have been criticized in terms of generalizability because of its highly contrived lab settings (Yoon 2010: 48). Utilizing data from WVS is superior to data from previous studies on cross-cultural in term of representativeness. Respondents from the survey are diverse and representatively selected to reflect various social groups not only are students from universities as previous research covered. Using data from WVS will limit shortcomings in terms of sampling that previous studies have contained, which generates more precise findings at the individual level that can generalize for the whole population.

3.2. Variables

Dependent variables

The dependent variables in this paper are IND index and COL index. In order to examine the cross-cultural differences in the value dimension of IND-COL, index of IND and COL at the individual level need to be constructed following the perspective of the

WVS. This work will apply methods of Kwang-Il Yoon (2010) proposed in author’s dissertation to create IND and COL index.

The WVS has an item carrying the meaning of IND and COL that satisfies properties of values and the item has been measured in all three waves of the survey (Yoon 2010: 59). The item is worded in the question: “Here is a list of qualities that children can be encouraged to learn at home. Which, if any, do you consider to be especially important? Please choose up to five!”. According to Kwang-Il Yoon (2010), “*this question specifically invokes the transmissional nature of culture by referring to “children” and “encouraged to learn at home” and implicates desirable value by asking respondents to choose qualities that they consider “especially important.” Moreover, it invokes family, which has been repeatedly demonstrated as “a prime agent of socialization” in political socialization literature*” (Yoon 2010: 59). The question has ten answers with two alternative options “Mentioned” coded as “1” and “Not mentioned” coded as “0”. The ten answers are in turn: (1) Independence; (2) Hard work; (3) Feeling of responsibility; (4) Imagination; (5) Tolerance and respect for other people; (6) Thrift, saving money and things; (7) Determination, perseverance; (8) Religious faith; (9) Unselfishness; and (10) Obedience.

Each component of IND and COL at the individual level will be constructed based on the following additive formulas:

IND index = (independence + feeling of responsibility + imagination + determination and perseverance) * 2.5

COL index = (tolerance and respect for other people + religious faith + unselfishness + obedience) * 2.5

The reasons for constructing the index of IND and COL as above are obviously accounted for by Kwang-Il Yoon (2010) in the author's dissertation. The notion of IND and COL in the formulation implies perspectives of prominent scholars such as Hofstede (1980 and 2001), Triandis (1995), Schwartz (1990), and Oyserman et al. (2002) in particular (Yoon 2010: 59). According to Oyserman and colleagues (2002), IND consists of independence, competition, goal, uniqueness, private, self-knowing, and direct communication. COL includes relation, advice, belonging, context, duty, group, harmony, and hierarchy (Yoon 2010: 59-60). According to Kwang-Il Yoon (2010) independence and responsibility belong to "independence" domain, imagination to "privateness", determination and perseverance to "competition", tolerance and respect for other people to "harmony", unselfishness to "relation" or "duty" or "harmony", obedience to "hierarchy" (Yoon 2010: 60). Religious faith should be included in the COL index at the individual level based on Schwartz's explanation that tradition represented "respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion impose" and listed "respect for tradition, accepting my portion in life, and devout" as examples (Yoon 2010: 60).

For the purpose of analysis, the sum of each formula above is multiplied by 2.5,

thereby giving people with the highest individualist sense the highest score of 10, while with lowest individualist sense would have the lowest index score of 0. The same procedure is applied to generate the collectivistic index.

Independent variables

Main independent variables in this paper are values towards family, friend, and work. Values towards family, friend and work are variables representing attitudes of respondents toward the degree of importance of family, friend, and work. These variables are measured from 1 - "very important" to 4 - "not at all important". I convert the scale of these variables with 1 - "Not at all important" to 4 - "very important", then, multiply it by 2.5. Thus, these variable have the same scales ranging from 2.5 (least important) to 10 (most important).

Region variable: The region variable derives from the country variable in the WVS survey. This variable is treated as a dummy variable in which "1" denotes the "West" (including the United States, West Germany, and Norway), and "0" denotes the "East" (including Japan, Taiwan, and Vietnam)

Control variables: To control possible effects of relevant variables and evaluate exactly effects of those main independent variables on the degree of preference to individualistic and collectivistic values, basic demographic variables consisting of gender, age, level of education and social classes (subjectively assessed) are included. Gender is a dummy variable with 1 "male" and 0 "female". Age is a continuous variable ranging from 17 to 96. Level of education is a variable having interval scale from 1 - lowest to 8 - highest. Finally, social class is also an interval variable with 1 denoting

lowest class and 5 representing the highest class.

3.3. Models

Multivariate regression using OLS method will be applied, which two multiple linear regressions will be run to identify the effects of value orientations towards family, friend and work on IND and COL among the regions. Linear regression is employed because IND index and COL index as response variables are measured on an interval scale, and more importantly, linear assumption between dependent variables (IND and COL index) and main independent variables (values towards family, friend, and work) is checked out and satisfied. The two equations are the following:

$$(1) \text{ IND index} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Value towards family}) + \beta_2 (\text{Value towards friend}) + \beta_3 (\text{Value towards work}) + \beta_4 \text{ region} + \beta_5 (\text{Value towards family}) * \text{region} + \beta_6 (\text{Value towards friend}) * \text{region} + \beta_7 (\text{Value towards work}) * \text{region} + \beta_8 (\text{Controls}) + \varepsilon$$

$$(2) \text{ COL index} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Value towards family}) + \beta_2 (\text{Value towards friend}) + \beta_3 (\text{Value towards work}) + \beta_4 \text{ region} + \beta_5 (\text{Value towards family}) * \text{region} + \beta_6 (\text{Value towards friend}) * \text{region} + \beta_7 (\text{Value towards work}) * \text{region} + \beta_8 (\text{Controls}) + \varepsilon$$

(ε stands for the error term)

In order to explore how different the effect of the value orientations on IND and COL index between the regions is, I create interaction terms (Brambor et al. 2005) by multiplying the value variables by the region variable and include them into the models. The region variable is seen as a condition for the differences in the effects of the value orientations on variations of IND and COL between the two cultures. Finally, to investigate how the effects of values towards family, friend and work on IND and

COL vary over time, two multiple linear regression models are separately run in each selected wave and analyzed in comparison to the others. In these models robust of standard errors is estimated to control for heteroscedasticity.

4. Results

4.1. Effects of value orientations towards family, friend and work on IND

Table 2 shows results of six linear regression models predicting IND index based on main effects of value orientations towards family, friends, and work. Of these, base models (model 1, model 3 and model 5) exclude interaction variables which in turn are included in full models (model 2, model 4 and model 6).

In base models (interaction terms excluded), the effect of the value towards family on IND index changes over time. In model 1 this value gives a negative impact on IND index but is not a predictor of IND because the association is not significant. In model 3 and model 5, the effect of the value towards family still remains negative but significant and its magnitude increases over time periods. Association between the value towards friend and IND index is inconsistent over time. This value positively influences IND in model 1 and model 5 with a decrease of its effect, while it yields a negative impact on IND index in model 3. The value towards work is a predictor of IND over three waves but its effect on IND index show a striking contrast. In model 1 this value generates a negative influence on IND, but the change is presented in model 3 and model 5. In these models, effects of the value towards work are significantly positive but drop about a half in model 5 as compared to model 3.

For the other variables in the base models, the effect of the region variable on IND index shows a changeable preference to IND between individuals from the “West” and the “East”. In model 1 and model 5, people from the “West” show less individualistic than people from the “East”, however, result from model 3 is converse. Gender is only a predictor of IND in wave 4 (model 1), which male is more individualistic than female. In two latest

waves, this variable is not correlated to IND. Age remains stable effect overtime on IND in the sense that the older people are, the less emphasized individualistic value is. While education is shown as an unstable predictor of IND index with positive effects in the first two models and negative effect in model 5, social classes remain its positive impacts on IND index and the impacts increase over time.

Table 2: Individualistic values and values toward family, friends, and work

Dependent variable: IND index						
Independent variables	Wave 4		Wave 5		Wave 6	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Value towards family	-.004 (.06)	0.11 (0.07)	-.07* (.03)	.03 (.04)	-.11*** (.04)	.005 (.05)
Value towards friends	.16*** (.03)	0.24*** (0.03)	-.07*** (.02)	.12*** (.02)	.04* (.02)	.02 (.02)
Value towards work	-.08*** (.02)	-0.08*** (0.03)	.09*** (.02)	.02 (.02)	.03* (.01)	.02 (.02)
Region (the West)	-1.28*** (.08)	5.43*** (1.19)	.19** (.06)	1.9** (.66)	-.90*** (.06)	.49 (.72)
Region* Value towards family		-0.46*** (0.11)		-.17** (.06)		-.18** (.07)
Region* Value towards friends		-0.24*** (0.05)		-.13*** (.04)		.03 (.04)
Region* Value towards work		-0.003 (0.04)		.13*** (.03)		.02 (.03)
Basic Demographics						
Gender (male)	.18* (.08)	0.16* (0.08)	-.02 (.06)	-.02 (.06)	.01 (.06)	.01 (.06)
Age	-.005* (.002)	-0.004* (0.002)	-.01*** (.002)	-.01*** (.001)	-.001*** (.001)	-.01*** (.002)
Education	.19*** (.02)	0.18*** (0.02)	.17*** (.01)	.17*** (.01)	-.04** (.02)	-.04** (.02)
Social classes	.12** (.05)	0.12** (0.05)	.10** (.04)	.09* (.04)	.26*** (.03)	.25*** (.03)
Constant	4.37*** (.58)	2.73*** (0.68)	4.49*** (.34)	3.74*** (.42)	6.53*** (.39)	5.60*** (.52)
N	3220	3220	6483	6483	6322	6322
Rsqr	0.1062	0.1191	0.0530	0.0586	0.0518	0.0531

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ – Standard errors in parentheses – Unstandardized coefficients are estimated.

In full models (interaction variables included), differences in the effects of values towards family, friend and work on IND index between the “West” and the “East” over time are presented. The effects of value towards family on IND remain diverse over three waves between the two regions. Because all interaction variables between region and value towards family are significantly related to IND index, the effect of value family towards IND index in the East is -0.46 in model 2, -0.17 in model 4 and -0.18 in model 6 (because preference is the “West”). Consequently, this effect in the West is -0.35 in model 2 (sum of -0.46 and 0.11), similarly, -0.14 in model 4 and -0.175 in model 6. Eventually, the negative correlation between the value towards family and IND are stronger among people from the “East” than among people from the “West”, but the magnitude of the negative correlation evidently decreases over time.

The difference in the impacts of the value towards friend on IND index between the “West” and the “East” is exposed in model 2 and model 4, which doesn’t appear in model 6. In these models, the negative effects of this value on IND index are also stronger in the “East” than in the “West” and decline between the two time periods (-0.24 compared to -0.13 in model 2 and -0.13 compared to -0.10 in model 4).

Regarding the effects of the value towards work on IND, though the difference between the “West” and the “East” in this association only emerges in wave 5 (model 4), it is converse to what happens in the effects of the values towards family and friend on IND between the two blocks. In model 4, the result shows a stronger positive preference to individualistic value among individuals favoring the value towards work in the “West” as compared to in the “East”

(0.13 for Eastern people and 0.16 for Western people).

As performed in base models, effects of basic demographic variables on IND index don’t have any remarkable change. In each wave, the R-squared coefficient is higher in models with interaction variables than in base models, which indicates that variance of IND index can be explained better when the interaction terms are included. In three full models, the R-squared coefficient is highest in model 2 and gradually declines in the rest models. This can reveal a message in which the variation of IND needs predicting by taking into account more other factors.

Taking above into consideration, the values towards family, friend and work are demonstrated as predictors of IND as expected. The more people prefer the importance of family, the fewer people emphasize IND. This negative association is stronger in the “East” than in the “West” and gradually declines in terms of its magnitude in both worlds over time. This happens similarly to people favoring the significance of friend. The results also support the assumption about the connection between the value towards work and individualistic value. Although the association is not obvious in all models, the outcome of the analysis reveals an evidence of positively preferring to individualistic value among people seeing work as important for them and this trend is shown stronger in the “West” than in the “East”.

4.2. Effects of value orientations towards family, friend, and work on COL

Effects of values towards family, friend and work on COL index are shown in table 3, which presents results of six linear regression models. Model 1, model 3 and

model 5 are base models excluding interaction variables. While model 2, model 4 and model 6 are full models with interaction terms.

Base models show changes in the effect of the value towards family on COL index over time. In model 1 this value gives a positive impact on IND index but not significant. Model 3 and model 5 reveal statistically significant and positive effect of this value on COL with an increase in magnitude between the two periods of time. Association between the value towards friend and IND index is inconsistent in the base models with only a significant and positive relationship in model 3. Similarly, the value of towards work is a predictor of COL index in only model 1 and its effect is absent in model 3 and model 5.

With other control variables in the base models, the effect of the region variable on COL index shows higher preference to collectivistic value among people from the “West” in comparison to people from the “East” and this trend is consistent over time. In all three waves, gender remains as a predictor of COL index, which male is less collectivistic than female and consistent over time. Regarding age, this variable is significantly correlated to COL with a positive effect. Education is shown as an unstable predictor of COL index with a significantly negative effect in the first two models and significantly positive effect in last models. While social classes show significant and negative effects on COL in last two models with an increase in the magnitude of the effects.

Table 3: Collectivistic values and values toward family, friends, and work

Dependent variable: COL index						
Independent variables	Wave 4		Wave 5		Wave 6	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Value towards family	.07 (.04)	-.001 (.05)	.20*** (.03)	-.03 (.04)	.21*** (.03)	-.03 (.04)
Value towards friends	-.03 (.02)	-.07** (.03)	.04** (.02)	-.003 (.02)	.02 (.02)	.001 (.02)
Value towards work	.04* (.02)	.07** (.02)	-.01 (.01)	.001 (.02)	-.02 (.01)	-.05** (.02)
Region (the West)	1.35*** (.08)	-2.15* (1.06)	.66*** (.05)	-4.21*** (.55)	.88*** (.05)	-3.54*** (.59)
Region* Value towards family		.29** (.10)		.43*** (.05)		.38*** (.06)
Region* Value towards friends		.14** (.05)		.12*** (.03)		.04 (.03)
Region* Value towards work		-.07 (.04)		-.04 (.03)		.05 (.03)
Basic Demographics						
Gender (male)	-.25*** (.07)	-.24*** (.07)	-.18*** (.05)	-.17*** (.05)	-.16** (.05)	-.15** (.05)
Age	-.001 (.002)	-.001 (.002)	.002 (.002)	.002 (.002)	.01*** (.002)	.01*** (.002)
Education	-.06*** (.02)	-.06*** (.02)	.07*** (.01)	.07*** (.01)	.17*** (.01)	.16*** (.01)
Social classes	-.07 (.05)	-.07 (.04)	-.06* (.03)	-.05 (.03)	-.20*** (.03)	-.19*** (.03)
Constant	3.71*** (.46)	4.51*** (.52)	.91** (.30)	3.31*** (.41)	.20 (.33)	2.93*** (.49)
N	3220	3220	6483	6483	6322	6322
Rsq	0.0975	0.1035	0.0452	0.0580	0.0785	0.0863

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ – Standard errors in parentheses – Unstandardized coefficients are estimated.

In full models with interaction variables, differences in the effects of values towards family, friend and work on COL index between the “West” and the “East” all three waves are shown. The effects of value towards family on COL index remain its positive direction but fluctuate in terms of magnitude over time and diverge between the two regions. The effects are higher in the “East” than in the “West” over three full models (respectively 0.29 compared to 0.28 in model 2, 0.43 compared to 0.40 in model 4 and 0.38 compared to 0.35 in model 6).

The difference in the impacts of the value towards friend on COL index between the “West” and the “East” emerges in model 2 and model 4 but disappear in model 6. In these models, the positive effects of this value on COL index are also stronger in the “East” than in the “West” and slightly decline between the two time periods (respectively 0.14 compared to 0.07 in model 2 and 0.12 compared to 0.09 in model 4). While the difference in the effects of the value towards work on COL between the

“West” and the “East” doesn’t emerge in all three waves.

Similarly, to base models, effects of basic demographic variables on IND index don’t have any remarkable change but an appearance of an insignificant association between social classes and COL index in model 4 when interaction variables included. All full models are shown as better than base models with higher R-squared coefficient in each wave. This means that variance of COL index can be explained better with models including interaction terms. In the three full models, the R-squared coefficient is highest in model 2.

Consequently, as specifically analyzed above, the value towards family is a strong factor to predict the variation of COL. It is evident that the more people consider family as important to them, the more people emphasize COL. This trend is more salient in the “East” than in the “West” and magnitude of the effects in both worlds fluctuate overall waves. A similar tendency also happens to people favoring the significance of friend. While no effects of the value towards work on COL support the expectation about the connection between these two variables. The sense is that people valuing the importance of work don’t have the propensity to COL.

5. Discussion and conclusion

This work is an application of the cultural comparative approach to detect to what extent there are differences in culture between the “West” and the “East” based on the cultural dimension of IND and COL. Different from previous studies on this stream, this paper is devoted to identifying the difference at the individual analysis, in which IND and COL are orthogonal

constructs and treated as states rather than individual traits. This perspective allows us to explain possibilities for any individual to have both individualistic and collectivistic attitudes at the same time. Theoretical assumptions for this approach have been developed with the main implication that the variations of IND-COL within individuals should be placed in dependence on social contexts or social relations that individuals take part in. One may have an individualistic orientation when interacting with co-workers or colleagues but tend to be collectivistic when contacting with family members. More specifically, individuals placing work more important tend to be more individualistic, while, individuals more favoring family and friends are inclined to be more collectivistic. This paper also takes a step further in considering how the variation of IND-COL affected by the values towards family, friend and work changes over time.

Results from the section above support the theoretical view which treats IND and COL as orthogonal concepts at the individual level of analysis. In this sense, the evidence in which IND and COL are well explained by social contexts and social relations that individuals engage in and can be considered in the sense of value orientations towards family, friend and work are documented. The variation of IND and COL within individuals is predicted by considering the degree people valuing work, family, and friend in their life. IND is preferred among individuals who place work as important but disfavor among those who value the sense of family and friend, while COL is favored among individuals considering family and friend as significant. The negative link between COL and the value towards work is not clear as expected.

Besides, there are differences between the “West” and the “East” in the performance of the link between value orientations towards family, friend and work and either IND or COL. The negative association between individuals’ preference to the value towards family and IND is found stronger in the “East” than in the “West” and happens over time. This is also the case for the relationship between individuals’ favor in the value towards friend and IND, which is not consistent in the sense of time changes. The positive association between the value towards work and individualistic preference is shown stronger in the “West” than in the “East”, however, this link is not confirmed by all waves of the survey. Regarding the relationship between the values and COL, people from the “East” is stronger than people from the “West” in favoring collectivistic values in relation to family and friend, which remains over time. There is no evidence of the difference in the association between the value towards work and individuals’ preference to COL between the two worlds.

The findings give rise to a discussion regarding the limitation of methodology in terms of measuring concepts and applying quantitative models for the future research. Measuring IND and COL is a very complex task that needs to ensure the validity and reliability of operationalizing components representing the two concepts. Developing IND and COL index depends on theoretical perspectives from which different perspectives lead to differently conceptualizing what IND and COL should be. Thus, this, in turn, may influence the results. Applying a new way of measuring IND and COL needs to be taken into account in the future study. Furthermore, a multilevel analysis is strongly recommended

to employ in the future research. This approach helps to take a closer look how value orientations towards work, family, and friend influence the variation of IND and COL within individuals. This application can detect how much the variance of IND and COL are determined by the effects of those value orientations at the individual level.

References

- Brambor, T., Clark, W. R., & Golder, M. 2005. Understanding interaction models: Improving empirical analyses. *Political analysis*, 14 (1): 63-82.
- Chan, W. T. 1963. trans. and comp., A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy.
- Gelfand, M. J., Triandis, H. C., & CHAN, D. K. S. 1996. Individualism versus collectivism or versus authoritarianism?. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26 (3): 397-410.
- Green, E. G., Deschamps, J. C., & Paez, D. 2005. Variation of individualism and COL within and between 20 countries a typological analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36 (3): 321-339.
- Heath, A., Fisher, S., & Smith, S. 2005. The globalization of public opinion research. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 8: 297-333.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. Culture’s consequences. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. Culture’s Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- World Values Survey. <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org>, August 1st, 2017 9:15 GMT + 7.
- Kim, R., & Coleman, P. T. 2015. The Combined Effect of individualism–Collectivism on Conflict Styles and Satisfaction: An Analysis at the Individual Level. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 22 (2): 137-159.

- Lonner, W. J., Berry, J. W., & Hofstede, G. H. 1980. Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.
- Lu, L., Gilmour, R., & Kao, S. F. 2001. Cultural values and happiness: An East-West dialogue. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(4): 477-493.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. 1991. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98 (2), 224.
- Maznevski, M. L., Gomez, C. B., DiStefano, J. J., Noorderhaven, N. G., & Wu, P. C. 2002. Cultural dimensions at the individual level of analysis the cultural orientations framework. *International journal of cross-cultural management*, 2 (3): 275-295.
- Nisbett, R. 2010. *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently... and*. Simon and Schuster.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. 2002. Rethinking individualism and COL: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses.
- Schwartz, S. H. 1990. Individualism-Collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 21 (2): 139-157.
- Shavitt, S., Torelli, C. J., & Riemer, H. 2010. Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism. *Advances in culture and psychology Vol, 1*: 309-350.
- Shweder, R. A., & Bourne, E. J. 1984. Does the concept of person vary cross-culturally. I Schweder, RA, LeVine, RA (red.): Culture theory. *Essays on mind, self, and emotion*.
- Tjosvold, D., Law, K. S., & Sun, H. F. 2003. Collectivistic and individualistic values: Their effects on group dynamics and productivity in China. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 12 (3): 243-263.
- Tong, R. L. (1991). Handshakes across the sea: Cross-cultural negotiating for business success. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(3), 30-40.
- Triandis, H. C. 1989. The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506.
- Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism.
- Triandis, H. C. 1995. Individualism & Collectivism. Westview Press.
- Trompanaars, F. (1993). Riding the waves of culture. London: Brealcy.
- Yoon, K. I. 2010. *Political culture of individualism and collectivism* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan).

Sự biến đổi của chủ nghĩa cá nhân và chủ nghĩa tập thể bên trong cá nhân: Ảnh hưởng của các giá trị định hướng gia đình, bạn bè và công việc

Nguyễn Hữu An

Tóm tắt: Chủ nghĩa cá nhân-chủ nghĩa tập thể là chiều cạnh thường được sử dụng trong những nghiên cứu so sánh văn hoá. Sự thể hiện của chủ nghĩa cá nhân và chủ nghĩa tập thể được phát hiện có sự khác biệt giữa các cấp độ phân tích. Trong khi hai khái niệm này được xem như là hai cực đối lập của một thể liên tục đơn hơn hướng ở cấp độ phân tích văn hóa, ở cấp độ phân tích cá nhân chủ nghĩa cá nhân và chủ nghĩa tập thể được chứng minh độc lập với nhau và có sự biến đổi bên trong mỗi nền văn hóa cũng như bên trong cá nhân. Những tranh luận gần đây đề xuất nên xem hai chiều cạnh này là những trạng thái biến đổi tùy thuộc theo bối cảnh xã hội thay vì xem là những đặc điểm cá nhân. Cách tiếp cận này cho phép giải thích tại sao mỗi một cá nhân vừa coi trọng những giá trị đề cao cá nhân vừa coi trọng giá trị đề cao tập thể. Dựa trên số liệu của ba pha khảo sát mới nhất từ chương trình Điều Tra Giá Trị Thế Giới, bài viết này thăm dò sự biến đổi của những chiều cạnh văn hóa này ở cấp độ phân tích cá nhân dưới tác động của những giá trị hướng đến những mối quan hệ xã hội thiết yếu mà cá nhân tương tác, cụ thể giá trị định hướng gia đình, bạn bè và công việc. Bên cạnh đó, sự khác biệt về sự ảnh hưởng/tác động của các giá trị này đến các chiều cạnh văn hóa giữa “phương Tây” và “phương Đông” cũng như sự thay đổi qua thời gian cũng được đề cập. Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy chủ nghĩa cá nhân được đề cao ở những người xem công việc là quan trọng và mối liên hệ này được thể hiện mạnh hơn ở nền văn hóa phương Tây, tuy nhiên không hiện diện rõ qua thời gian. Trong khi đó, chủ nghĩa tập thể được đề cao ở các cá nhân xem gia đình và bạn bè quan trọng, và những mối liên hệ này được thể hiện mạnh hơn ở các nước phương Đông.

Từ khóa: Nghiên cứu so sánh văn hoá; chủ nghĩa cá nhân; chủ nghĩa tập thể; giá trị xã hội.