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ABSTRACT

Traditional views of individualism and collectivism suggest that Eastern countries will exhibit collectivistic tendencies while Western countries will exhibit individualistic tendencies. The purpose of this study was to examine whether these findings have changed in the intervening 25 years of global evolution. An electronic survey was administered to 209 students in the United States and 315 students in China. The survey included 17 items from previous research on individualism and collectivism. Results indicate that there are significant differences on all nine questions dealing with collectivism and six of the eight questions dealing with individualism. However, these differences were unexpected, showing that the United States is becoming more collectivist while China is becoming more individualistic. These results may be due to the globalization of trade and the increasing homogeneity of Generation Y around the world.

INTRODUCTION

The dichotomous cultural phenomenon of Collectivism/Individualism was described by Hofstede (1980) over two decades ago. As a sub-set of cultural measures, this classification scheme defines cultural differences as being devoted to either creating a society in which individuals are raised in very strong cohesive groups which protect them from outside pressures (collectivism) or societies in which individuals are expected to emphasize their own personal goals with much less regard for the “group” as a whole (individualism). Triandis and Suh (2002) suggest that those individuals living in collectivist cultures view environmental variables, such as cultural norms and obligations, as being relatively stable and that it is the individual that must be willing to change to fit into the environment. On the other hand, they suggest that those raised in individualistic cultures are much more likely to see themselves as being stable, in terms of attitudes, rights, and personality, with their environment being the variable that should change to fit the individual.

It is commonly assumed that cultures emanating from countries such as China and other Eastern Asian countries would be more likely to exhibit features common to collectivist societies while Western cultures would be more likely to exhibit features representative of individualist societies (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989a, 1989b). While these assumptions may have been
supported in the past, it is plausible that as China experiences rapid economic growth and progresses as an industrialized nation; their culture will be under environmental pressure to become more individualistic in nature. In addition, western countries are changing rapidly though immigration. Some researchers believe that these changes could lead more individualistic cultures to become more collectivistic (e.g., Lalonde and Cameron, 1993). Therefore, this study will examine whether the Chinese culture is still solidly collectivistic or if it is moving toward a more liberal, loose-fitting individualistic setting and the United States culture is still solidly individualistic or if it is moving toward a more socialist, tight-fitting collectivist setting.

LITERATURE

It is clear that the work of Hofstede (1980) brought the concepts of collectivism and individualism to the forefront of academic interest. Since the introduction of this early work, numerous articles have been written which examine the causes and results of these cultural phenomena. Collectivism and individualism have been conceptualized as including beliefs, attitudes, norms, roles, values and behaviors in different cultures (Triandis, 1989a, 1989b, 1995). This multidimensional conceptualization has led researchers to measure these two constructs in various domains, such as those of values (Bond, 1988; Miller, Bersoff & Harwood, 1990), attitudes (Hui, 1988; Hui and Triandis, 1986) and reports of behaviors (Hui, 1988; Yamaguchi, 1990, 1994). Research using these measures suggests that the cultures of Africa, Asia and Latin America tend to be collectivistic; while those of Western Europe, Canada and the United States tend to be more individualistic (Bond, 1988; Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989a, 1989b). Collectivism and individualism have been proposed as possible underlying variables used to examine cultural differences in social behavior (Triandis, 1995). These two variables have been the source of a significant body of research in the 25 years since Hofstede (1980) identified these constructs as opposite poles of a value dimension differentiating world cultures.

The assumption that groups are socially bound together and that individuals are obligated to act in a particular fashion (Oyserman, Coon & Kemmelmeier, 2002) seems to be the central theme of collectivism. The concept of collectivism suggests that group membership determines one’s identity; the individual should sacrifice their own goals for the good of the group; satisfaction is derived from carrying out the expected social role; and emotional restraint is valued as a method of ensuring group harmony. Features associated with collectivism include being concerned with the in-groups’ fate and giving its’ goals priority over ones’ own; maintaining harmony, interdependence and cooperation and avoiding open conflict within the in-group. Reciprocity is a key requirement among in-group members, who operate within a related network of interlocking responsibilities and obligations. Self-definition is cased in terms of ones’ in-groups, and there is a sharp distinction between in-groups and out-groups. Morris, Davis, and Allene, (1994) similarly describes collectivism as requiring one to place the interests of the group ahead of one’s personal interests.
thereby focusing on cooperation, group harmony, and group welfare. They indicate that collectivism results in more harmonious relationships, greater synergies, and better support systems than do Individualistic cultures. The negative side of this may be a loss of self and greater emotional dependence on the group.

In contrast to collectivism, Morris, Davis and Allene (1994) indicate that individualistic cultures place greater emphasis on self-sufficiency, personal goals, and a deriving of satisfaction and pride in one’s own accomplishments. They also believe that individualistic cultures may enhance one’s self-concept, self-confidence, selfishness, and expediency. Individualism features greater concern with personal rather than in-group fate and giving personal goals priority over in-group goals; feeling independent and emotionally detached from ones’ in-groups; accepting confrontations within in-groups; and defining the self independently of ones’ in-groups (Ho and Chiu, 1994; Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989a, 1989b; Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990). Oyserman, Coon and Kemmelmeier (2002) also indicate that the central focus of individualism is that individuals tend to be very independent of one another. They maintain that in individualistic societies, people tend to have a very positive sense of self-worth; personal success, uniqueness and open emotional expression is valued; and relationships and group memberships tend to be flexible rather than permanent.

It is of particular interest to find that past research has indicated that China and numerous Eastern Asian countries are more likely to have collectivistic cultures than those cultures found in the west. For example, using the work of Hofstede (1991) to rank countries based on individualism scores, Fan and Zigang (2004) conclude that Western countries such as the United States (91), Canada (80), United Kingdom (89), Germany (67), and France (71) tend to score much higher on individualism than does China (20). They further suggest that individuals raised in these Western cultures will tend to rely on themselves in determining what should be done and will be very reluctant to cooperate as they place more value on independence and control. However, the Chinese culture will show more dependence on groups and institutions and individuals will respond with more loyalty to groups of which they are a part. A resulting difference in behavior is also shown in the work of Fan and Zigang (2004) as they found differences in the way managers from China and the United States react in different circumstances. Specifically, they found that American managers place more importance on contracts while Chinese managers place more importance on relationships; when faced with conflict, American managers prefer a more direct approach while Chinese managers prefer indirect forms of influence; American managers are more likely to make risky decisions; and Chinese managers are likely to pay more attention to social and interpersonal relationships.

As world cultures become less isolated, change is undoubtedly going to take place. It may be a mistake, therefore, to automatically assume that Eastern cultures are going to remain collective and that Western cultures will remain more individualized in nature. Indeed, literature suggests that as a country’s economy becomes more developed and the inhabitants of that country become more
affluent, their culture tends to move away from collectivism and move more toward the individualistic end of the cultural spectrum (Hofstede, 1980 and Triandis, 2004). An examination of Hofstede’s (1980, 1991) work reveals a predominance of developed nations ranking high on the individualism scale, while less developed nations rank lower. In another study, Katz, Juni & Shope (1993) examined two groups of Chinese students. The first group lived in China while the second group had lived in the United States for at least a year. Each group was given the Rokeach Value Scale and their responses to questions measuring Terminal and Instrumental values were then compared. The results indicate that individuals who are coming from a more privileged class tend to place higher value on individualism and a Capitalistic system while those holding a lower or less privileged class may value collectivism and a more Socialistic system. These results may be instrumental in understanding not only cultural changes in developing nations, but also the changes that many Western countries are experiencing.

Western countries like the United States and Great Britain are experiencing dramatic increases in immigration, legal as well as illegal, and there may be a tendency for these groups to be much more collective in nature than one would find in the general population of these countries. Lalonde and Cameron (1993) found that immigrants from lower income areas were more likely to embrace behaviors most often exhibited in collectivistic cultures. They further found that first and second generation immigrants, particularly those from disadvantaged countries, were more likely to exhibit collectivistic behaviors than immigrants who had been in the country for longer periods of time. Given the large number of immigrants coming to the United States, especially from Mexico, and the large number of Middle-eastern immigrants which have located in Great Britain, we may see a movement, at least initially, toward collectivism as these individuals look for the acceptance and security that is often found in group membership.

It is also interesting to note that as a country becomes influenced by other cultures they become less “tight” and “loosen” their restrictions on the individual thereby creating a more individualistic society in which individuals are freer to express themselves through differing behaviors. Logic, and perhaps simple observation, leads us to believe that eastern counties tend to be “tighter” while western countries tend to be “looser” in their cultural restrictions. Chan et al. (1996) suggest that individuals living in “tight” cultures would tend to exhibit higher levels of uncertainty avoidance as norms and behaviors are well defined and conformity is expected. The contrary view is that those individuals raised in “loose” cultures tend to have much less compunction to “follow the rules” and act in a much more individualistic manner. Indeed, when Chan et al. (1996) tested the concept of “tightness-looseness” in Japan and the United States they found significant differences between the two countries and concluded that, as hypothesized, the Japanese culture was much “tighter” while the culture of the United States was found to be much “looser,” thereby reinforcing the concepts of collectivism and individualism.

The beginnings of a possible change in the cultural spectrum have been found in recent research. As early as 1986, data was indicating that there might not be as much of a division
between cultures as previously thought. Feather (1986) found that Australian and Chinese values do not fall as expected on the individualism–collectivism continuum. In fact, each of the samples showed cultural characteristics of both individualism and collectivism. Feather concluded that it was likely that the individualism–collectivism phenomenon may produce different results depending upon the particular values that are being examined. Perhaps a more compelling argument for reconsidering the traditional individualism–collectivism continuum was presented by Chung and Mallery (1999/2000) as they found that in a comparison of seven individualism–collectivism (INDCOL) subscales, respondents from the United States were rated as being more collectivist than Chinese respondents on six of the seven scales. It was surmised that increases in foreign and private businesses may be influencing the Chinese respondents and that larger numbers of Asian Americans may have influenced the United States sample.

A very recent study conducted by Chen et al. (2006) examined the personality concepts of idiocentrism and allocentrism, which are considered to be parallel with the concepts of individualism–collectivism, across three different cultures. The results of this study indicated that those respondents from Poland indicated higher levels of collectivism than those from either the United States or Hong Kong. While the authors indicated that they had hypothesized that the Polish respondents would be higher in collectivism than those from the United States, they did not anticipate that respondents from the United States would indicate higher levels of collectivism than those respondents from Hong Kong, which was thought to be a more collectivistic society. It was concluded that the respondents from Hong Kong might have been socialized in a large metropolitan area that has been under strong western influence for many years and are therefore more individualistic than expected. They further concluded that if the respondents from the United States had grown up in smaller rural communities they may have more collectivistic tendencies than might have been expected. These two studies indicate that there may be a change taking place in the degree of cultural collectivism that traditional cultures have previously shown, given that they found a shift in the United States samples toward becoming more collectivistic.

This change is of particular interest to marketers as a change from collectivism to individualism may well indicate that consumers living in previously collectivist cultures will find a desire for new products that express their individualism. If this is the case, marketers will be forced to make adjustments to the techniques they are presently using in order to effectively reach these consumers. For example, Erdem, Swait & Valenzuela (2006) suggest that in terms of brand usage, those in collective cultures should be more likely to rely on the brand choice of the group and rely heavily on information passed through word of mouth. Their research confirmed the notion that uncertainty avoidance and collectivism would lead to an increase in the credibility of known and used brands by increasing that brands overall quality perception. They further recommend that companies should position their products to match a country’s cultural values, thereby reducing risk and increasing social acceptance. It is suggested that advertising should communicate group identification and the feeling that if one uses a product they will be considered part of a particular...
group. It is also important to understand that even though the same products may be bought in both Western and Eastern cultures, they are not bought for the same reasons nor do the products serve the same social functions in both cultures (Wong and Ahuvia, 1998). For example, these authors point out that brand-named luxury items are being consumed in large volumes by East Asian consumers. They found, however, that luxury products were not being purchased for individual personal satisfaction, but rather to show social conformity as wealthy Asian consumers are “expected” to purchase these products as an outward show of group or elite class membership. They further report that consumers from Eastern cultures are more likely to place greater importance on a products’ symbolic value, if it is publicly consumed, than would consumers from a Western culture. If cultures that have been traditionally collective are moving towards more individualistic attitudes, advertising, promotion and packaging techniques will need to be modified from those focusing on belongingness and risk reduction to those that emphasize individual value expression. Understanding differences in traditionally collectivist and traditionally individualistic countries will help marketers plan strategies to reach consumers who either consider other’s opinions or rely extensively on their own. The purpose of this study is to examine whether traditional findings related to individualism and collectivism may have changed in the intervening 20-25 years of global evolution. Based on the findings of the majority of existing research, two hypotheses were formed regarding individualism and collectivism in relation to the United States and China.

**H1:** Collectivism will be stronger in China than in the United States.

**H2:** Individualism will be stronger in the United States than in China.

**METHODOLOGY**

In order to better understand individualism and collectivism within the United States and China, an electronic survey was administered to 209 students at a large Midwestern public University in the United States and 315 students at a large satellite university in Dalian, China. It is important to note that Dalian, China is located along the rapidly growing coastline of China and is also a major port for international commerce. The electronic survey consisted of 60 questions or statements, 17 of which dealt with individualism/collectivism. Participants responded on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). All of the scale items were drawn from previous research. With respect to collectivism, seven of the items were taken from Hui’s Nonkin collectivism scale (Hui, 1988), and two items were taken from the Triandis general attitudes general others collectivism scale (Triandis, 1994). With respect to individualism, six of the items were taken from Hui’s Nonkin Individualism scale (Hui, 1988) and two were taken from the Triandis general attitudes general others individualism scale (Triandis, 1994). The items were selected based upon their applicability in both cultures. The items that were dropped from the Hui (1988) scale were the three in each category related to dealing with neighbors. Given that both samples were student...
samples, we felt that studying behaviors toward neighbors was less important than toward in-groups and out-groups. The 17 questions dealing with the two variables of individualism and collectivism are included in Appendix A.

The literature related to individualism and collectivism is somewhat mixed as it relates to Western and Asian cultures. The norm has been to expect Asian countries to be much more aligned with collectivism and Western cultures to exhibit more individualistic characteristics. The data presented in this study joins the growing literature that tends to contradict the earlier assumptions. Data presented in Table 1 compares Chinese students with students from the United States in terms of their views on collectivism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>China Mean</th>
<th>China Standard Deviation</th>
<th>United States Mean</th>
<th>United States Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col1</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col3</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col4</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col6</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col7</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col8</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col9</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability (α) for the 9-item scale = .763

Results indicate that significant differences were found for all nine questions, which dealt with collectivism. It is most interesting to note that the Chinese sample scored higher on only three of the nine questions while the United States sample scored higher on the remaining six questions. It is of particular interest to find that the United States sample scored higher on questions that seem to be at the core of collectivism. Specifically, they scored significantly higher on questions eight and nine that read, “One of the pleasures in life is to be related interdependently with others” and “One of the pleasures of life is to feel part of a large group of people.” The findings shown in Table 1 would indicate that, overall, the United States sample values collectivism more highly than does the Chinese sample therefore, H1 would be rejected.

The results depicted in Table 2 deal with the respondents views toward individualism. It is interesting to note that six of the eight questions were found to be significantly different between the two samples and the United States sample was found to be higher on only one of the eight
questions. The only question where the United States sample scored higher was question three which read “When I am with my colleagues or school friends, I would rather assert my individual opinion than simply remain part of the group.” The Chinese sample recorded mean scores higher than their United States counterparts on all of the remaining questions dealing with individualism therefore, H2 would be rejected.

### Table 2: Individualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>China Mean</th>
<th>China Standard Deviation</th>
<th>United States Mean</th>
<th>United States Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind1</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind2</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind3</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind4</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind6</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind7</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind8</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability (α) for the 9-item scale = .763

**DISCUSSION**

The results of this study indicate that the United States may be becoming less individualistic and moving more toward a collectivistic way of thinking. China also seems to be experiencing a shift in the country’s cultural beliefs. The data shown in this study seems to rather clearly show an unexpected difference between the groups. This difference may be indicative of a shift toward a more individualistic society in present day China from the more traditional collective society of the past. Berry, Kim, Minde & Mok (1987) suggested that populations that are in cultural transition, such as the Chinese, are particularly interesting to study because the individuals may experience cultural, social and psychological changes. They may also be experiencing changes in their political, economic, religious, social and linguistic systems. Changes in their social relationships may require redefinition of in-groups and out-groups and assigning different significance to ethnicity. Finally, psychological changes may require shifts in attitudes, values, behaviors and lifestyles. The Chinese students who participated in this study were taking classes in English and registered at a satellite campus of a U.S. school. Thus, they are not your typical Chinese, but instead, more exposed to western thinking and values than students studying in a purely Chinese educational institution. This may be reflected in their responses showing the increases in
individualism and the decrease in collectivism. However, while these students have been exposed to the American style of learning, none had ever left China.

With respect to the findings that American students exhibited greater collectivism than in past studies, this could be due to the student sample as well, but for different reasons than above. Currently, college students are the main swell of Generation Y. As a cohort group, they are much different from previous generations. They have been raised differently; Generation Y is the best educated and most culturally diverse generation in history (Wolburg and Pokrywczyński, 2001), a combination which has made this generation exceedingly tolerant and open-minded toward different lifestyles such as homosexuality, single parent households, etc. (Morton, 2002; Paul, 2001). The television has played a significant role in Generation Y’s life, and as such MTV and reality shows have led to a generation attracted to bold, fast-moving graphics and the belief that everyone has an equal voice (Paul, 2001). Additionally, this cohort multi-tasks with media, with over 50% using more than one medium simultaneously (Kennedy, 2001). This group was raised in groups, starting with “play dates” and culminating in team sports. The focus of their young lives was teamwork and an “everybody wins” mentality. This may have translated into more of a group mentality than we have seen in prior generations. Stone, et al. (2001) define them as follows: their peer group, and its opinion of them, is very important to them; they have tight groups of friends, almost tribal in nature; their friends understand them, grow up with them and earn their trust. Miles (2003) claims that Gen Yers crave “connections” and group projects that allow them to work with talented colleagues. These individuals have spent 20% of their youth by themselves because of divorce and dual income families. Thus, they often prefer working in a group to solve problems. A study by Yankolovich Partners, as reported in U.S. News and World Report, described this generation as “pluralistic,” meaning that distinctions of race, ethnicity and gender are of little interest to them—they tend to overlook differences and treat everyone the same (Leo, 2003). All of these factors could explain our results indicating that the U.S. sample is more collectivistic and less individualistic than in past research.

CONCLUSION

In this research, Chinese students were found to be less collectivistic and more individualistic than in past research. Likewise, the U.S. students were found to be more collectivistic and less individualistic than in the past. A number of factors could have contributed to these findings. While both samples of students are members of Gen Y, only the American students have experienced the technological changes associated with this cohort. China is just beginning to experience western culture and western practices, and the students in this sample are at the forefront of this melding of cultures, given that they are studying at an American University’s satellite campus, even though none has ever left China. Our findings support the recent work of Chen et al. (2006) who also used student samples and found a shift in the U.S. sample toward higher levels of collectivism. Future
research could examine whether this shift is evident in other samples of individuals, who are not part of Gen Y.

It could also be that general cultural, political, economic, and social changes are occurring for both samples in this study. Future research could monitor the trends in these changes and the resulting changes in attitudes and reported behaviors with respect to collectivism and individualism. In addition, given the changing roles of men and women in developing countries such as China, studying how these changes impact attitudes could be beneficial. While there are many promising areas of future study, researchers should avoid interpreting all cross-cultural differences as attributable to these particular variables. These dimensions should not be viewed as the end all for cultural differences (Hofstede 1991). Instead, collectivism and individualism are broad approximations of cultural dimensions that need further definition and elaboration. More importantly, they are not the only dimensions of cultural differences (Rhee, Uleman and Lee, 1996). Only when we understand the relational context in which collectivism and individualism are manifest will we begin to understand the specific kind and quality of the relationships between an individual and the group and how those relationships affect marketing strategy.
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## Appendix A

**Collectivism and Individualism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collectivism: Questions</th>
<th>Individualism: Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col1.</strong> If possible, I would co-own a car among close friends in order to have them save money.</td>
<td><strong>Ind1.</strong> I prefer to deal with personal problems, instead of consulting friends about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col2.</strong> I would like to live near close friends.</td>
<td><strong>Ind2.</strong> When deciding on an occupation, I do not consider my close friends opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col3.</strong> I agree with my friends on where to go shopping and dining.</td>
<td><strong>Ind3.</strong> When I am with my colleagues or school friends, I would rather assert my individual opinion than simply remain part of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col4.</strong> When a school friend does me a favor, I feel obligated to return the favor.</td>
<td><strong>Ind4.</strong> I have never loaned class notes to any fellow students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col5.</strong> Forming a study group with classmates does not bring any loss; it can only help me.</td>
<td><strong>Ind5.</strong> In general, collaborating with a person who is less competent than you, does not bring any positive results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col6.</strong> To do well in school, classmates’ help is crucial.</td>
<td><strong>Ind6.</strong> Let’s assume a group of students is discussing where to eat. The most popular choice is a new restaurant. However, one of the students claims that he had eaten there before and the food was terrible. Despite his opinion, if the others decide to go to that restaurant, would you agree that you should Not go with them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col7.</strong> I would lend money to a classmate who needs money to buy books.</td>
<td><strong>Ind7.</strong> When faced with a difficult personal problem, it is better to decide what to do yourself, rather than follow the advice of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col8.</strong> One of the pleasures in life is to be related interdependently with others.</td>
<td><strong>Ind8.</strong> One should live life independently of others as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col9.</strong> One of the pleasures of life is to feel part of a large group of people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>