The Family Allocentrism Idiocentrism Scale: Further Convergent Validity Exploration

Blake Evan Kirschner

Pacific University
The Family Allocentrism Idiocentrism Scale: Further Convergent Validity Exploration

Abstract
In order to improve measurement in cross-cultural research it is necessary to find a reliable, ingroup-specific scale along with effective priming methods. It is hypothesized that the Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale (FAIS) will show convergent validity with the Self Construal Scale (SCS) and the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (HVICS) and that the pronoun circling task will be effective in changing perceptions of self-reported family connectedness as measured by the FAIS. The sample consisted of 58 university students recruited through e-mail. Results indicated that the pronoun-circling task was ineffective at changing perceptions of self-reported family connectedness. Furthermore, the results indicated that the FAIS had moderate convergent validity with the HVICS. However, the FAIS was found to significantly positively correlate with an unexpected subscale in the SCS therefore indicating poor convergent validity.

Degree Type
Thesis

Rights
Terms of use for work posted in CommonKnowledge.

This thesis is available at CommonKnowledge: http://commons.pacificu.edu/spp/71
Copyright and terms of use

If you have downloaded this document directly from the web or from CommonKnowledge, see the “Rights” section on the previous page for the terms of use.

If you have received this document through an interlibrary loan/document delivery service, the following terms of use apply:

Copyright in this work is held by the author(s). You may download or print any portion of this document for personal use only, or for any use that is allowed by fair use (Title 17, §107 U.S.C.). Except for personal or fair use, you or your borrowing library may not reproduce, remix, republish, post, transmit, or distribute this document, or any portion thereof, without the permission of the copyright owner. [Note: If this document is licensed under a Creative Commons license (see “Rights” on the previous page) which allows broader usage rights, your use is governed by the terms of that license.]

Inquiries regarding further use of these materials should be addressed to: CommonKnowledge Rights, Pacific University Library, 2043 College Way, Forest Grove, OR 97116, (503) 352-7209. Email inquiries may be directed to: copyright@pacificu.edu

This thesis is available at CommonKnowledge: http://commons.pacificu.edu/spp/71
THE FAMILY ALLOCENTRISM-IDIOCENTRISM SCALE: FURTHER CONVERGENT VALIDITY EXPLORATION

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF
SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
HILLSBORO, OREGON

BY
BLAKE EVAN KIRSCHNER
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY
JULY 24, 2009

APPROVED: Shawn Davis, Ph.D.
Abstract

In order to improve measurement in cross-cultural research it is necessary to find a reliable, ingroup-specific scale along with effective priming methods. It is hypothesized that the Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale (FAIS) will show convergent validity with the Self Construal Scale (SCS) and the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (HVICS) and that the pronoun circling task will be effective in changing perceptions of self-reported family connectedness as measured by the FAIS. The sample consisted of 58 university students recruited through e-mail. Results indicated that the pronoun-circling task was ineffective at changing perceptions of self-reported family connectedness. Furthermore, the results indicated that the FAIS had moderate convergent validity with the HVICS. However, the FAIS was found to significantly positively correlate with an unexpected subscale in the SCS therefore indicating poor convergent validity.

Keywords: family connectedness, self-construal, individualism/collectivism, reliability, content validity, convergent validity, priming, familialism
# Table of Contents

Abstract .............................................................................................................................. ii

List of Tables ..................................................................................................................... v

Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 1

Literature Review ............................................................................................................... 2
  Individualism and Collectivism ....................................................................................... 2
  Horizontal and Vertical Dimensionality ....................................................................... 5
  Familialism within Collectivism .................................................................................... 6

Self-Construal Theory ....................................................................................................... 8

Measurement Concerns ..................................................................................................... 12
  Reliability ....................................................................................................................... 12
  Content Validity .............................................................................................................. 14

Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale ......................................................................... 17

Priming in Cross-Cultural Research ................................................................................ 18
  Pronoun-Circling Task .................................................................................................. 20

The Present Study .............................................................................................................. 20

Hypotheses ......................................................................................................................... 21

Methods ............................................................................................................................ 22
  Participants ..................................................................................................................... 22
  Materials ......................................................................................................................... 22
  Procedure ....................................................................................................................... 24

Results ............................................................................................................................... 25
  Effect of Priming ............................................................................................................ 26
List of Tables

Table 1. Participant Ethnicity........................................................................22

Table 2. Intercorrelations Between all Scales..............................................27
Introduction

Cross-cultural research plays a vital role in the adaptation of western-based psychological thought to new cultures and ways of thinking. For over 25 years this mode of research has been of interest to a wide range of researchers for the main reasons of linking psychology to the largest concentrations of population in the world (in Asia), minorities in the United States, agricultural-rural cultures, lower and middle classes, and numerous other social phenomena (Kagitcibasi & Berry, 1989). Current theories within this field of study are mainly outgrowths of the constructs of individualism and collectivism, originally promulgated in the seminal work of Hofstede (1980) in which he examined the work-related values of IBM employees from 66 countries. In brief, Hofstede (1980) defined individualism as an emphasis on personal goals, autonomy, self-fulfillment, and one’s needs over the needs of ingroups such as family, friends, community, or work organization. He defined collectivism as the polar opposite; the increased importance of ingroup needs over those of the individual. Individualism and collectivism have been the most frequently measured variables in cross-cultural research (Triandis, 1989), however, from the original definitions proposed by Hofstede (1980) there have been further refined theories incorporating the same constructs. Currently, the most prominent of these theories are Individualism and Collectivism (I/C; Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) and Self-Construal Theory (SCT; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

While a tremendous amount of research involving these theories has been published there is currently still a debate about the validity of the measurement systems utilized in studies (Chen & West, 2008; Freeman & Bordia, 2001). There appears to be
no current consensus that the measurement of individualism and collectivism is as reliable or valid as is necessary to draw accurate conclusions on the research. Therefore there is a need for measurements of individualism and collectivism with higher levels of reliability and validity. The purpose of the present study is to further assess the convergent validity the Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale (FAIS: Lay et al., 1998) in an attempt to provide a reliable, valid, and theoretically sound measurement tool for use in the field of cross-cultural psychology. A pronoun-circling task (Brewer & Gardner, 1996, Gardner, Gabriel, & Lee, 1999) will also be utilized in this study to further assess its effectiveness as a manipulation procedure and its effects on the FAIS.

**Literature Review**

**Individualism and Collectivism**

In its initial form I/C was conceptualized as a bipolar and unidimensional construct which could explain cultural differences in social behavior at the level of different nations (Hofstede, 1980). Within this definition individualism was the diametric opposite of collectivism, with a single nation unable have concomitantly high levels of both individualism and collectivism. While there have been varying definitions of individualism and collectivism, the basis of current I/C theory was developed in a series of articles (Hui & Triandis, 1986; Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985; Triandis et. al., 1986, 1988). The consensus is that individualism emphasizes a focus upon the personal self while keeping other relationships in the periphery (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Hsu, 1983; Kagitcibasi, 1994; Kim, 1994; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Sampson, 1977; Triandis, 1995). Similarly, collectivism has been
generally characterized as defining oneself as part of a group where personal goals overlap with the goals of the ingroup, and in times of conflict ingroup goals take precedence (Schwartz, 1990; Singelis et al., 1995). In the early stages of research Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990) stated that the bipolar, unidimensional construct of I/C could be more easily understood as a set of attributes, and therefore have important consequences. The authors stated that, in individualistic cultures, these broad attributes include emotional detachment from ingroups, primacy of personal goals over ingroup goals, behavior regulated by attitudes and cost-benefit analyses, and a comfort with confrontation. In collectivistic cultures these broad attributes include a focus on family integrity, self-definition by ingroup terms, behavior regulated by social and cultural norms, hierarchy and harmony within the ingroup, a view of the ingroup as homogeneous, and a strong ingroup/outgroup distinction.

While the broad definitions of individualism and collectivism have mainly remained the same their relation to each other has undergone significant change. Newer research on the I/C construct has argued that I/C is better conceptualized as two distinct constructs, each with a group of related attributes (Ho & Chiu, 1994; Kagitcibasi, 1987; Kim, 1994; Sinha & Tripathi, 1994; Triandis, 1990; Yu & Yang, 1994). In this updated conceptualization a culture can concurrently have high levels of both individualism and collectivism. The reasoning behind this change is that different aspects of individualism or collectivism are elicited depending on context. Specifically, Schwartz (1994) proposed that societies have at least some representation of individualistic and collectivistic worldviews depending on the specific situation. Therefore societies deal with individual- and collective-oriented value choices separately. A culture is classified
as either individualistic or collectivistic depending on the number of situations in which one or the other is cued (Oyserman & Lee, 2008). Cultures are not stagnant in their expression of I/C but vary depending on the presented stimulus. Instead of conceptualizing I/C as a rule that determines how all situations will be viewed, “the defining attributes of cultures are best thought of as fluctuating pressures or tendencies, which may or may not be manifest in a particular individual or context” (Singelis et al., 1995, p. 243). This definition leaves open the possibility of individual differences. Triandis (1989) therefore defined individualism at the personal level idiocentrism and collectivism at the individual level allocentrism in order to distinguish between culture and the individual.

In a recent meta-analysis, Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier (2002) found that the United States was significantly more individualistic than Japan in a country-level analysis. However, this same analysis found that Americans were also significantly higher in collectivism than were Japanese. Mutual exclusivity of the I/C constructs would have made this finding impossible. In a moderator analysis the authors found that Japanese only reported higher collectivism than Americans when the scales utilized in the individual studies contained questions about preference for working in groups and did not include questions about striving to maintain group harmony. Therefore measures of collectivism for these nations differed depending on the specific component of collectivism, further speaking to the conceptualization of I/C as distinct constructs with unique sets of attributes. In general, the authors found that differences between the United States and other highly collectivistic countries were reduced when collectivism was assessed using a scale that included the concepts of belonging to ingroups and
seeking others’ advice. This empirical evidence supported the authors’ claim that individualism and collectivism are “domain specific, orthogonal constructs differentially elicited by contextual and social clues” (p. 8).

Horizontal and vertical dimensionality. In his review of the cross-cultural research literature, Triandis (1995) proposed the need for additional dimensions to be added to the I/C construct. The reason for this addition can be exemplified by the previously discussed finding that Americans were found to have higher levels of collectivism than Japanese (Oyserman et al., 2002). These authors found that this difference was more pronounced when only reliable scales were used, while there was no difference found between the countries when comparisons used low-reliability scales. The scales with increased reliability were more sensitive in discerning differences between cultures on the I/C construct. Therefore vital information is lost with the use of less reliable measures of I/C. In order to increase the reliability of a scale measuring I/C, Triandis (1995) recommended the addition of horizontal and vertical dimensions to the I/C construct, creating horizontal individualism (H-I), vertical individualism (V-I), horizontal collectivism (H-C), and vertical collectivism (V-C). Triandis (1995) claimed that measuring these four specific clusters of attributes is more desirable than either measuring the broader, more abstract construct of I/C or the specific individual attributes themselves.

Singelis and colleagues (1995), in their article on the theoretical refinement of I/C, operationalized H-I, V-I, H-C, V-C for inclusion into their Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism Scale. Horizontal collectivism is the pattern in which an
individual sees all others within the ingroup as similar. The self is merged with the group and all members of this group are equal. Therefore less emphasis is put upon social hierarchies within a society with strong H-C tendencies. Triandis (1995) proposed that the Israeli kibbutz and many monastic orders are examples of H-C. In its most extreme form H-C would resemble theoretical communism. Vertical collectivism is the cultural pattern in which the individual is an aspect of a hierarchical group. The group is pivotal to the individual’s definition of self, but the individual is not equal to others within the group. Therefore the group takes on a hierarchical structure that dictates which members hold power over others. The individual within this society values serving and sacrifice. Triandis (1995) suggested that India and traditional Greece are exemplifications of V-C cultures. The role of Confucianism within Chinese culture can also be seen as an example of V-C, especially in relation to the concept of filial piety. Horizontal individualism is a cultural pattern in which an individual both sees the self as autonomous but more or less equal to all others. Therefore the individual differentiates between him/herself and the closest ingroup but at the same time does not see other as unequal in standing. Triandis (1995) posited that H-I can be seen in Swedish and Australian culture. An emphasis on autonomy and the inherent differences between individuals is indicative of the V-I cultural pattern. Within these cultures the self is independent of ingroups and therefore self-reliance becomes an accepted and salient part of life. Individuals within these cultures value competition, which inherently breeds a social hierarchy. Triandis (1995) named the United States and France as countries that epitomize V-I.

Familialism within collectivism. Although collectivism is domain-specific there is still debate as to whether it encompasses all domains, specifically ingroups. Primary in
this debate is the role of the family unit in relation to the concept of collectivism.
Familialism is defined as “relatedness to one’s family, seeking harmony with family
members, or supporting and seeking advice from family” (Oyserman et al., 2002, p. 10).
Gaines et al. (1997) found that the constructs of individualism, collectivism, and
familialism were separate dimensions, with familialism and collectivism being positively
correlated. However, the scales used in this research were only validated through factor
analysis and internal consistency measures. The authors did not assess for the convergent
validity of their scales with other measures of I/C. In a confirmatory factor analytic study,
it was found that both individualism and collectivism were better conceptualized divided
by kin and non-kin factors (Rhee, Uleman, & Lee, 1996). This led the authors to view
familialism as an important element of collectivism but not entirely separate. Finally,
Lay et al. (1998) argued that familialism is the essential core of collectivism because the
family is the most salient and important ingroup in the lives of individuals (Kagitcibasi,
1990). In an attempt to settle this debate, Oyserman and colleagues (2002) examined
existing research on familialism as part of their meta-analysis. The authors found that
when collectivism was assessed as family obligation European Americans were found to
be more collectivistic than Chinese and Japanese individuals, which is contradictory to
other cross-national research on the overall construct of collectivism. This finding may
indicate that familialism is at least a differential aspect of collectivism, if not a
completely different construct. Whether familialism is the core of collectivism, an
integral aspect of collectivism, or a separate construct it is clear that more research is
necessary to provide an empirically validated conceptualization.
While I/C has been instrumental in explaining cross-cultural differences it is not the only widely-used theory. In the next section a different way of conceptualizing these differences will be discussed.

*Self-Construal Theory*

As a corollary to the I/C construct, Markus and Kitayama (1991) proposed Self-Construal Theory (SCT) as a way of explaining how differences in self-schemata influence individual experience. The authors proposed that there are interdependent and independent selves, with independence closely related to individualism and interdependence with collectivism. These divergent self-schemata were coined self-construals of the self. The authors proposed that an individual’s self-construal greatly affects the organization of self-relevant processes such as cognition, emotion, and motivation. As opposed to the I/C construct, which was developed to explain differences between nations and cultures, SCT describes cultural differences on the level of the individual.

Markus and Kitayama (1991) theorized that in independent self-construals the individual defines the self as separate from the social context. Emotions are experienced as internal and private, and therefore expressing the self, realizing one’s internal attributes, and promoting one’s own goals become necessary. A person with an independent self-construal engages in self-evaluation by comparing the self to others regardless of context. The authors theorized that in the interdependent self-construal the individual defines the self as connected with their social context and therefore strives to maintain harmony within this context. Emotions are experienced as external and
determined by ingroup members’ appraisals of the situation. A person with an interdependent self-construal utilizes relationships with others in specific contexts to define the self.

These differences in self-construal have important cognitive implications. In their original conceptualization of SCT Markus and Kitayama (1991) proposed three important consequences for differing self-construals. First, individuals with interdependent self-construals are more context- and ingroup-oriented and therefore will be more attentive and sensitive to others than individuals with independent self-construals. Second, interdependence dictates that, “the unit of representation of both the self and the other will include a relatively specific social context in which the self and the other are embedded” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 231). Finally, basic, nonsocial cognitive activities are affected by the social context and the reactions of others when interdependence is the dominant self-construal.

Research on SCT has borne out these proposed cognitive implications. Comparisons across cultures have provided evidence that individuals with opposite self-construals attend differentially to the same stimuli and cross-cultural research has revealed that members of Asian cultures, who are typically more interdependent, are more attentive to negative information about the self (Heine & Lehman, 1999). This increased attention to negative information allows the individual to better maintain group harmony and improve relations with ingroup members by allowing the individual the opportunity to address the situation and decrease the chance of open confrontation. In another study participants were presented with a social judgment task (Miller, Bersoff, &
Harwood, 1990) in which a character refused to give a friend directions to an art store because she was busy reading an exciting book. Participants with interdependent self-construals rated this behavior as less desirable than did participants with independent self-construals (Gardner et al., 1999). Participants with interdependent self-construals also rated the decision to help the friend as an obligation more often than those with independent self-construals. These findings illustrate the implications SCT has for how individuals perceive and possibly act within social situations.

An individual’s self-construal also has an effect on motivation. Individuals with an independent self-construal are commonly motivated by the forces of self-expression, autonomy, and separateness (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). On the contrary, individuals with interdependent self-construals will focus more on the ingroup or some other referent, and therefore motivation will stem from these sources rather than existing as an inner drive. Because of this, individuals with an interdependent self-construal will experience motivation as an effort to stifle one’s own needs and desires in deference to the needs of the group (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). For example, Asian American students have been found to be more motivated by a choice made by an ingroup member (mother or classmate) than a decision the students made themselves (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999). The opposite was true for Anglo American students, leading the authors to propose that the disparity was due to the differing self-construals of the children. In a study of Chinese children it was found that socioemotional relatedness to the person making the choice was a moderator in the children’s motivation to complete the task (Bao & Lam, 2008). If the person making the decision was a member of an ingroup (such as the family) and the child felt a high degree of relatedness to them, then the child would be highly motivated.
This finding reflects the need of individuals with an interdependent self-construal to gain their motivation from a referent rather than strictly from the self, especially if this referent is part of an important ingroup.

Specific emotions can have different connotations depending on an individual’s self-construal. Emotions that create and foster independence, also known as ego-focused emotions, are often incongruent with interdependence. The open expression of ego-focused emotions can become problematic for an individual with an interdependent self-construal because, “it is the interpersonal context that assumes priority over the inner attributes, such as private feelings” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, pp. 236). Therefore these emotions must be suppressed to maintain group harmony. Anthropological research has shown that strong ego-focused emotions, such as anger, are highly feared in interdependent societies such as that of Tahiti (Levy, 1973; Soloman, 1984). This aversion to anger has also been observed in Japanese infants, who were found to have been relatively more traumatized by their mother’s expression of anger than American children (Miyake, Campos, Kagan, & Bradshaw, 1986). While expressions of anger could also prove to be problematic for an individual with an independent self-construal, SCT states that ego-focused emotions are more frequently expressed and experienced within this self-construal.

It is important to note that both interdependent and independent self-construals are present in every individual; this is similar to I/C in that they are not mutually exclusive. A series of studies (Aron & Aron, 1986; Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992; Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991; Aron & Fraley, 1999) demonstrated that there are specific
instances when an individual with an independent self-construal may incorporate another into the self-view. For example, in close intimate relationships the individual, regardless of original self-construal, will treat another person as similar to the self. Gardner and colleagues (1999) argued that self-construal is a form of adaptation to specific social situations. They theorized that, “although an individual’s culture may strongly determine the self-construal that is chronically accessible, self-construals may shift in response to situational accessibility” (p. 321). Therefore self-construal can either be determined by the over-riding cultural context, which is termed chronic self-construal, or by situational factors, and any one individual can intermittently fluctuate between these self-construals. The fluidity of self-construal has important implications for the measurement of the construct and the application of SCT to cross-cultural research.

Measurement Concerns

**Reliability.** While both I/C theory and SCT have greatly contributed to the understanding of cross-cultural differences in human behavior, cognition, and experience there are considerable methodological flaws in the research that have yet to be addressed. Primary among these concerns is that measurement of these constructs has been mainly unreliable, and therefore severely limited. Measurement at the cultural level has proven to be partially successful, while measurement reliabilities have been consistently low at the individual level (Singelis, et al., 1995).

Oyserman and colleagues (2002) found that for studies examining within-United States comparisons two thirds of the scales of individualism and over half of the scales of collectivism had low reliability. In all they found that about half of current cross-natural
research was based on measures with Cronbach reliabilities lower than .70. Using scales with limited reliability may prevent researchers from finding important cross-cultural differences. However, increasing the reliability of utilized measures becomes problematic for cross-cultural research, and I/C in particular, because of the broad nature of the constructs (Singelis, et al., 1995). The broader the construct the lower the fidelity, and therefore the less reliable the measure of that construct (Cronbach, 1990).

For the purposes of research many authors have attempted to measure cross-cultural differences, such as I/C, with a single mean score. For example, Hui’s (1988) General Collectivism Index scale score, a broad average of six subscales measuring different aspects of collectivism, had average Cronbach alpha coefficients of .62 and .58 (reported in Hui, 1988). A possible solution to this dilemma would be to increase the bandwidth (e.g. make the scale longer and more inclusive), thereby increasing reliability. However, increasing the bandwidth will also succeed in lowering fidelity as the two are inversely related. This led Cronbach and Gleser (1965) to conclude that more valid information will be obtained from having several scores with relatively low alphas rather than having fewer scores with higher alphas. Therefore, “rather than attempting to measure [I/C] as a multidimensional construct with a single mean score, it may be preferable to assess each hypothesized element separately with a highly reliable scale” (Oyserman et al., 2002, p. 41).

One way of separately measuring each element of the I/C and SCT constructs is to specify the relevant ingroup of interest, such as family, friends, or co-workers. Through this strategy researchers can decrease the chance that their scale will be ambiguous and
therefore sensitive to a variety of social contexts (Rhee et al., 1996). As discussed previously, both I/C and SCT are considered to be fluid, domain-specific constructs and therefore dependent on social context. Without specifying context, researchers leave open the possibility that each participant will construe the questions differently depending on any number of factors. When developing his widely used INDCOL scale, Hui (1988) suggested that

One may be very collectivistic with regard to friends, but totally independent and isolated from the family. Another person may be most concerned with family and disregard people outside the family. Theoretically, therefore, different [individualisms] and collectivisms are possible.

(Hui, 1988, pp. 20-21, italics in original)

Therefore the concept of I/C and SCT varying depending upon specified ingroup has been incorporated into the theoretical definitions of the constructs but has yet to be fully utilized in their measurement. The specification of ingroups in the measurement of I/C and SCT will not only potentially improve scale reliability but also increase the confluence of theory and measurement.

Content validity. Additional methodological flaws exist in the measurement of I/C and SCT when the content validity of scales is lowered through an improper conceptualization of the dimensionality of these constructs. I/C, as discussed above, was originally conceptualized as a bipolar, unidimensional construct. Over time, research has indicated that this notion was incorrect. I/C has proven to be increasingly
multidimensional (Ho & Chiu, 1994; Kagitcibasi, 1987; Kim, 1994; Sinha & Tripathi, 1994; Triandis, 1990; Yu & Yang, 1994), culminating with the addition of the horizontal and vertical dimensions (Singelis et al., 1995). However, measurement has lagged behind theory as there is still a tendency for measuring I/C and SCT as unidimensional constructs.

Chen and West (2008) outlined four specific reasons why treating multifaceted constructs such as I/C and SCT as unidimensional can be problematic. First, a scale can lose content validity when important aspects of the construct are under-represented by having a smaller number of items. Content validity can also be affected when the opposite occurs and a particular construct is over-sampled, which could artificially make a minor aspect seem like a vital one. Another problem arises when additional constructs not discussed in theory are reliably measured and therefore contaminate the scale, creating construct-irrelevant dimensions. Lastly, varying facets of each construct may be differentially related to ingroups, leading to inconsistent group effects.

Although I/C has been amended with the addition of horizontal and vertical dimensions, existing I/C measures continue to be treated as unidimensional (Chen & West, 2008). Therefore, differential aspects of these constructs lead to unexpected or inconsistent findings, such as was discussed previously in the section on familialism and collectivism. That same meta-analysis (Oyserman et al., 2002) also found inconsistencies in the overall level of individualism of Japanese and American students, with Japanese students scoring lower on individualism when uniqueness was included in the scale, but equal to American students when competitiveness was included. Measurement variation
such as those stated above will severely impede the development and application of I/C and SCT.

Chen and West (2008) reviewed two widely used scales of measurement - the Scale of Horizontal and Vertical Collectivism and Individualism (Singelis et al., 1995) and the Self Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994). The authors concluded that the Scale of Horizontal and Vertical Collectivism and Individualism includes only one scale that is actually unidimensional (V-I), while the H-I, H-C, and V-C scales were all multidimensional and yet represented by a singular score. The authors also posited that the Self Construal Scale conceptualizes independence and interdependence as unidimensional given that each of these constructs has an accompanying subscale producing a single numerical value. However, the independence subscale actually consists of questions meant to measure independence, uniqueness, direct communication, shyness, and using someone’s first name while the interdependence subscale measures preference of ingroup goals over personal ones, respect of authority, respect of modesty, and oneness. Additionally problematic is that both relational and collective groups are included in the interdependence subscale. In order to increase the content validity of I/C and SCT measurement, assessment tools must differentiate between each specific component within each broader construct.

There has been additional evidence that the parsing of the I/C and SCT constructs involves including a reference to a specific ingroup. In a confirmatory factor analysis conducted on the data of 340 Australian college students (Freeman & Bordia, 2001) it was found that individualism and collectivism were meaningfully structured by a
reference-group domain. Therefore, while group specific domains were found to not be completely orthogonal it was still possible for a student to be individualistic in relation to friends and collectivistic in relation to family members. It was also found that within each of these domains individualism and collectivism were polar opposites. These findings provide evidence that I/C and SCT are best conceptualized as bipolar, multidimensional, and reference-group specific constructs. They should therefore be measured as such in order to maintain concurrence between theory and measurement.

*Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale*

The Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale (FAIS) was developed by Lay et al. (1998) as a measure of family connectedness. The authors intended to make the FAIS context-bound by choosing the family as the specified ingroup. As an ingroup the family has proven to affect a high degree of psychological differentiation across cultures (Georgas, 1993). Broad individual differences develop in the experience of connectedness with family depending on the person, context, and the culture (Triandis, 1995). The family is conceptually different from other ingroups and therefore should be measured separately. The authors of the scale made sure to differentiate family allocentrism-idiocentrism from a general concern and interaction with others, as the latter may be more closely related to gender differences (Kashima et al., 1995).

As a bipolar measure that specifies family as a reference group, the FAIS fulfills the basic requirements discussed above to increase reliability and content validity. The original scale development found coefficient alphas for the FAIS to range between .80-.84 (Lay et al., 1998). A more recent study found the FAIS to have a test-retest reliability
of .93 and an internal consistency alpha of .84 (Sato, 2007). In that same study the FAIS was also found to have the highest internal consistency alpha when compared to those of the Self Construal Scale and the Scale of Horizontal and Vertical Collectivism and Individualism. While the FAIS has shown increased reliability over more widely used scales, it is still not clear whether the FAIS provides increased validity over other scales utilized in cross-cultural research. In an attempt to assess the scale’s convergent validity, Sato (2007) found that family allocentrism as measured by the FAIS was positively correlated with H-C and V-C as well as an interdependent self-construal. The author also found that family allocentrism was negatively correlated with H-I and V-I as well as an interdependent self-construal. However, the population used in the sample was limited to undergraduate university students in Canada, prompting the author to question the generalizability of the study.

*Primed in Cross-Cultural Research*

Even with reliable and valid measures, the use of a single research method in the social sciences will lead to fragmentation (Triandis et al., 1990). The dominant methodology utilized in current cross-cultural research is correlational. While studies incorporating this design have widely contributed to the understanding of cross-cultural differences, they have also ignored the fluidity of I/C and SCT constructs (Oyserman & Lee, 2008). This has proven to be problematic because, “they cannot provide access to process, leaving open the question of whether individuals from different societies always differ in [I/C] values or if the salience of these values depends on what comes to mind in the moment” (Oyserman & Lee, 2008, p. 328). Potential solutions to the problem of
fragmentation are difficult to find. Culture and its accompanying societal structures are impossible to manipulate, therefore making it difficult to utilize experimental conditions in this mode of research.

Priming methods, however, offer a practical way to incorporate experimental manipulation into a field dominated by static correlational methodology. I/C and SCT are situation specific constructs and therefore should be amenable to change. By successfully priming and making aspects of the I/C or SCT constructs more accessible and salient, researchers can measure whether individuals differ to a correspondingly larger or smaller degree. This would provide clear evidence that the observed differences are due to I/C or SCT and not external factors (Oyserman & Lee, 2008).

Recent research has demonstrated the utility of priming to change one’s self-construal within a specific situation (Aaker & Lee, 2001; Gardner, Gabriel, & Hochschild, 2002; Gardner et al., 1999; Lee, Aaker, & Gardner, 2000; Mandel, 2003). It is important to note that priming methods only work when the prime is culturally inconsistent, and therefore in opposition to the individual’s chronic cultural view or self-construal. For example, Gardner and colleagues (1999) proposed that because Western cultures chronically encourage an independent self-construal, an interdependent prime used on European American college students should affect social judgments to a greater degree than an independent prime. Their findings demonstrated that the situational activation of an interdependent self-construal created differences in social judgment that mirrored cross-cultural differences. They also found that the students who received an independent prime did not differ from students in the control group.
**Pronoun-circling task.** One of the more common methods of priming has been the pronoun-circling task (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Gardner et al., 1999). In this task, study participants are presented with a paragraph that is either written in the first person singular (using the pronouns I, me, and my) or in the first person plural (using the pronouns we, our, and ours). Gardner and colleagues (1999) proposed that the use first person plural pronouns, “primes social representations of the self that are more inclusive than that of the personal self-concept” (p. 87). Therefore it is analogous to an interdependent self-construal. Current research has supported the power of pronouns shifting perception. Fitzsimons and Kay (2004) found that exposure to the pronoun we, as compared to the pronouns you and I or she and I, resulted in study participants rating an interpersonal relationship as higher in quality and closeness. In their meta-analysis, Oyserman and Lee (2008) examined the effect of the pronoun-circling task as a function of the prime and the dependent variable, finding a mean weighted effect size of .34.

**The Present Study**

The present study is an investigation of the relationship between the constructs of family allocentrism-idiocentrism, I/C, and SCT. Additionally, a stimulus aimed at priming individualistic and collectivistic thought was administered to determine its influence on individual presentation within measures of family allocentrism and idiocentrism.

This study replicates previous research (Sato, 2007) and further assesses the convergent validity of the Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism in relation to the Scale of Horizontal and Vertical Collectivism and Individualism and the Self Construal Scale with
differing populations, which has been called for in the literature. The present study also examines the impact of priming collectivistic and individualistic thought on reported family allocentrism-idiocentrism and indication of I/C adherence.

**Hypotheses**

Based on the findings of the preceding literature review, it was hypothesized that the pronoun-circling task would be effective in shifting an individual’s self-reported family connectedness when the prime is the opposite of the individual’s chronic self-construal. Therefore European American and African American participants receiving the interdependent prime would report significantly higher family connectedness than European American and African American participants receiving either the independent or control prime. Asian American and Latino/a participants receiving the independent prime were expected to report significantly lower family connectedness than Asian American and Hispanic participants receiving either the interdependent or control prime. It was also hypothesized that the FAIS was expected to show significant convergent validity with both the Self Construal Scale and the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale. Also, the FAIS was expected to be positively correlated with the H-C and V-C subscales on the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale and the interdependent subscale of the Self Construal Scale. The FAIS will be negatively correlated with the H-I and V-I subscales on the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale and the independent subscale of the Self Construal Scale.
Methods

Participants

Fifty-eight graduate and undergraduate students from two geographically-distant universities participated in the present study (13 male and 45 female). Ages ranged from 20 to 48, with a mean age of 26.45 years. Twenty-two participants received the neutral prime, 18 received the independent prime, and 18 received the interdependent prime. A breakdown of participant ethnicity is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Participant Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White / Caucasian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

The following measures were utilized in the present investigation.

Demographic Questionnaire (Appendix A). Demographic information gained from all study participants included age, gender, and ethnicity. Each participant was instructed to choose their gender and write in their age and ethnicity. After the data was
collected participants were assigned into the aforementioned groups based on their self-reported ethnicity.

*Pronoun-Circling Task (Appendix B).* The pronoun-circling task (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Gardner et al., 1999) was utilized to prime differing self-construals. Participants were presented with one of three paragraphs describing a day travelling in a city. Participants were asked to count the number of pronouns used in each paragraph. The control paragraph was written in the third person tense (using the pronoun “it”). The paragraph priming independence was written in the first person singular tense (using the pronouns “I”, “me”, and “my”). The paragraph priming interdependence was written in the first person plural tense (using the pronouns “we”, “our”, and “ours”).

*Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (Appendix C).* The Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (Singelis et al., 1995) categorizes the individual along four distinct dimensions of cultural adherence: horizontal individualism, horizontal collectivism, vertical individualism, and vertical collectivism. The measure consists of 32 items within which individuals (on a five-point Likert-type scale) indicate their adherence to statements corresponding to individualistic and collectivistic belief.

*Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale (Appendix D).* The Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale (Lay et al., 1998) consists of 21 items within which individuals (on a five-point Likert-type scale) indicate their adherence to allocentric and idiocentric belief. A high summary score indicates high family allocentrism and a low summary score indicates high family idiocentrism.
The Self Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994) consists of 30 items within which individuals (on a seven-point Likert-type scale) respond to statements aimed at determining the degree of independence and interdependence within an individual’s self-construal. It has been suggested that independent self-construal (the belief that the “self” is an independent entity that is unique to others) is common in Western cultures and that an interdependent self-construal (the belief that the “self” is a harmonious part of social structure) is common in many non-Western cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

**Procedure**

Study participants were recruited via e-mail notice at two university locations (one in Oregon and another in Texas). The e-mail recruitment message sent to students at the participating university locations included a hyperlink that directed each individual to the study website. Upon entering the study site, the participant was presented with a screen welcoming them to the study and asking them to select a hyperlink corresponding with their month of birth. Specifically, individuals born in January, February, March, and April selected one site, individuals born in May, June, July, and August selected another site, and individuals born in September, October, November, and December selected the final site.

Upon selecting the appropriate link, participants were directed to a screen presenting them with the informed consent document. Next they were presented with the demographics questionnaire. After completing this questionnaire the participant was presented with a priming task which involved them counting all the pronouns in a short
paragraph. Participants in the first of the three study groups were presented with the neutral prime. Participants in the second were presented with the interdependent prime. Participants in the third group were presented with the independent prime. Upon completion of this task, the participant was presented with and asked to complete the Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale, the Self Construal Scale, and the Measure of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism. Once the participant completed these measures, they were thanked for their time and participation. It took approximately 30 minutes to complete study participation.

Results

Fifty-eight graduate and undergraduate students participated in the present study. All study variables were examined to identify any incomplete data or outliers. If a participant didn’t complete 4 or more of the questions in any scale, their responses for that measure were removed from further analyses. As a result, responses from 2 participants on the FAIS, 2 participants for the independent self-construal subscale, and 3 participants for the interdependent self-construal subscale were removed from the analysis. Cases were flagged as an outlier when they were at least two standard deviations from the mean score (either positively or negatively). Examination of outlying cases resulted in the responses of 1 participant being removed for the FAIS and 1 for the interdependent scale of the self-construal measure.
Effect of Priming

Comparisons were made between groups of individuals whose prime corresponded with their currently held allocentric belief and those whose prime did not. Baseline independent belief was assumed for European American and African American participants and baseline interdependent belief was assumed for Asian American and Hispanic participants.

T-test analysis revealed no significant difference between independent individuals who received either the independent or neutral prime and those who received the interdependent prime, \( t(1, 36) = -.864, p = .393 \). Likewise, t-test analysis revealed no significant difference between interdependent individuals who received either the interdependent or neutral prime and those who received the independent prime, \( t(1, 12) = -.525, p = .609 \).

Scale Validation

To determine the convergent validity of the FAIS, a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was conducted. The results can be found in Table 2 below.
Table 2

Intercorrelations Between all Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FAIS</td>
<td>- .17</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.467*</td>
<td>.271*</td>
<td>.354*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H-I</td>
<td>- -.011</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.594*</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. H-C</td>
<td>- -.096</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.661*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. V-I</td>
<td>- .173</td>
<td>.536*</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. V-C</td>
<td>- .144</td>
<td>.515*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Independent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interdependent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

As indicated in the preceding analysis, a significant correlation was found between scores on the FAIS and both the H-C (r (54) = .304, p < .05) and V-C (r (54) = .467), p < .05) dimensions. Also, a significant correlation was found between scores on the FAIS and both the Independent (r (52) = .271, p < .05) and Interdependent (r (51) = .354, p < .05) self-construal dimensions.

Significant correlations were also found between the H-I and V-I and H-C and V-C dimensions of the measure of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (r (56) = .385, p < .05 and r (56) = .411, p < .05, respectively). While the H-I and V-I dimensions were significantly correlated with Independent self-construal (r (54)
= .594, p < .05 and r (54) = .536, p < .05 respectively), the H-C and V-C dimensions were significantly correlated with Interdependent self-construal (r (53) = .661 p < .05 and r (53) = .515, p < .05 respectively).

Discussion

Based on its successful use in previous research (e.g., Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Gardner, et al., 1999), it was hypothesized that the pronoun-circling task utilized in the present study would be effective in shifting an individual’s self-reported family connectedness when the prime is the opposite of the individual’s chronic self-construal. This hypothesis, however, was not supported. There are several explanations for the lack of successful priming. First, this finding could provide evidence that the pronoun-circling task is ineffective when applied to the family as opposed to the broader construct of self-construal. Family is particularly salient and influential, and therefore an individual’s perceptions of this ingroup may not be as amenable to change as perceptions of other less-significant ingroups. Further study on the family as an ingroup component of I/C and SCT is necessary to determine if it is indeed more static than are other facets.

It is also possible that the increased reliability of the FAIS, as compared to scales with greater bandwidths, makes priming more difficult. I/C and SCT are fluid constructs that differ depending on the situation and therefore measurement of these constructs with a single score includes a large amount of variance. The FAIS is ingroup-specific, which limits this variability in measurement. A byproduct of lowered variance may be decreased fluidity, leading to greater difficulty in affecting change. Therefore it may not just be the family ingroup that is more static than larger I/C and SCT constructs but any
specified ingroup. Further, the results may also indicate that the construct measured by the FAIS should be considered a fixed trait or attribute. Especially in relation to college-aged participants, an individual’s perceptions of family connectedness may become fixed after a certain stage of development.

A second hypothesis within the present study was that the FAIS would be positively correlated with the H-C and V-C subscales and negatively correlated with the H-I and V-I subscales on the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale. In that the FAIS was significantly positively correlated the H-C and V-C subscales, it can be speculated that higher family connectedness is conceptually similar to the broader concept of collectivism. However, the FAIS was not negatively correlated with the H-I and V-I subscales as expected. Therefore family connectedness may be unrelated to individualism. These findings indicate that the convergent validity of the FAIS in relation to the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale is spurious at best.

It appears that a highly individualistic person can still experience high levels of family allocentrism as well as idiocentrism. A possible explanation for this finding would be that collectivistic individuals respond to the FAIS in a more uniform direction than do individualistic individuals. Collectivistic individuals, therefore, may see family connectedness as an obligation more than a choice. Conversely, individualistic participants may be equally as likely to feel high or low levels family connectedness thus indicating that these participants have a degree of choice as to how they relate to their family as compared to other ingroups.
These findings also provide evidence that the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the I/C construct may not be related to family connectedness. Therefore, whether an individual sees all others as equal or as part of a social hierarchy appears to have no bearing on perception of family connectedness. Most of the participants in this study were college students and therefore would be at the lower levels of the social hierarchy within their family. It would be interesting to see if there is any variance in perceptions of family connectedness depending on where an individual ranks in their family hierarchy.

A third hypothesis of the present study was that the FAIS would be positively correlated with responses on the Interdependence subscale and not correlated with the responses on the Independence subscale of the Self Construal Scale. This hypothesis was not supported. The resulting significant correlation of the FAIS to both subscales may indicate poor convergent validity for the FAIS. Therefore, the FAIS may be measuring an unintended domain, causing it to be positively correlated with an independent self-construal. This would indicate that additional measurement refinement is necessary before classifying the FAIS as a valid instrument of family connectedness.

Another possible explanation of this finding is that the Self Construal Scale is not ingroup- or situation-specific. Given the fluidity of self-construal it is possible that individuals conceptualize their family as different from how they perceive all other social situations. It could be possible that participants with highly independent self-construals experience their relationships with friends and co-workers as disconnected but feel extremely connected to their family. This could be particularly true for individuals who have assimilated to the American lifestyle but whose parents are immigrants from a
collectivistic country. While there is variance in the interdependent self-construal domain, it appears that individuals with a dominant interdependent self-construal are more consistent in their perception of high family connectedness. These findings, especially in relation to individuals with independent self-construals, provide some evidence that the family should be measured separately from other ingroups.

There were several limitations to this study. The population was almost entirely comprised of college-aged students. Perceptions of family connectedness within cultures may vary with different stages of development. Research needs to be conducted with participants from varying stages of life in order to fully assess the validity of the FAIS. Also, this study was conducted within the United States with a large number of American citizens. Therefore the findings of this study are not generalizable to individuals from other countries. In order to assess whether it is appropriate to use the FAIS with non-westernized populations additional research on the FAIS needs be conducted with individuals who do not live within the United States or Canada. While these limitations should be addressed in future investigation, the findings of the present study provide a much needed bit of clarity into the highly complex construct of cultural identity.
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Appendix A

Demographic Questionnaire

Please respond to each of the following…

Age: ______

Gender: ______ Male ______ Female

Number of older siblings: _______________

Number of Younger Siblings: _______________

Are you a US citizen?

What is your ethnicity?

Please indicate the extent to which you identify with this ethnicity (on a scale from 1 to 7)

How would you rate yourself?
   a) Very ethnic
   b) Mostly ethnic
   c) Bicultural/Multicultural
   d) Mostly Americanized
   e) Very Americanized
What is the ethnicity of your mother/mother figure?

What is the ethnicity of your father/father figure?

Indicate the generation that best applies to you:
   a) 1st generation = I was born in another country
   b) 2nd generation = I was born in the U.S., either parent was born in another country
   c) 3rd generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and all grandparents were born in another country
   d) 4th generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S. and at least one grandparent was born in another country
   e) 5th generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and all grandparents were also born in the U.S.
   f) Don't know what generation best fits since I lack some information

If you were born in another country, please indicate how many years you have lived in the U.S.: ______

Did any members outside of your immediate family live in your home when growing up?
If so, how many?

What is your parents' current marital status (by parent we mean primary caretaker before you were 18 years old)?
   a) Married
   b) Separated
   c) Divorced
   d) Widowed
e) Single (never married)

Do you currently have a step-mother or step-father?

What is your religious affiliation?
   a) Catholic
   b) Protestant/Christian (non-Catholic)
   c) Jewish
   d) Muslim
   e) Hindu
   f) Buddhist
   g) Other: __________
   h) No religious affiliation

Where do you currently live?
   a) At home with parents
   b) At home with adult relatives
   c) On campus (Dormitory)
   d) Off-campus apartment or house

If you are not currently living with your parents, do you live with them
   During the summer (yes or no)
   Sometimes during the school year (yes or no)

How many total months a year do you live with your parents?
   a) zero
   b) less than one month
c) one to three months
d) 4-6 months
e) 6-12 months

When growing up (before the age of 18) were one of your parents primarily a “stay at home” parent? _____ Yes _____ No

Estimated Average yearly income of parents: __________

How often do you have contact with your MOTHER/MOTHER FIGURE during the school year (i.e. phone calls, email, visits)
   a) every day
   b) several times a week
   c) once a week
   d) once every two weeks
   e) once a month
   f) once every couple of months
   g) once or twice a year
   h) no contact
   i) I don't have a mother/mother figure

How often do you have contact with your FATHER/FATHER FIGURE during the school year (i.e. phone calls, email, visits)
   a) every day
   b) several times a week
   c) once a week
   d) once every two weeks
   e) once a month
f) once every couple of months

g) once or twice a year

h) no contact

i) I don't have a father/father figure

What was the education level of your biological father? (If known) __________

What was the education level of your mother? (If known) __________

What is your overall GPA?

What language do you prefer to use?

a) ethnic language only (please specify:___________)
b) mostly ethnic language, some English
c) ethnic language and English about equally
d) mostly English
e) only English

What language do you speak with your parents?

a) ethnic language only (please specify:___________)
b) mostly ethnic language, some English
c) ethnic language and English about equally
d) mostly English
e) only English

What language do you speak with your friends?

a) ethnic language only (please specify:___________)
b) mostly ethnic language, some English

c) ethnic language and English about equally

d) mostly English

e) only English

If you could pick, whom would you prefer to associate with?

a) almost exclusively people from my group

b) mostly people from my group

c) about equally people from my group and people from other groups

d) mostly people from other groups

e) almost exclusively people from other groups
Appendix B

Priming Task

Please read the following paragraph carefully. Once finished, please go back and count the number of PRONOUNS found within the paragraph and indicate this number in the space below the paragraph itself. The pronouns may be singular (e.g. he, she, me, I, you, mine, yours, etc. ) or plural (e.g. we, they, our, their, etc). Please take your time.

Prime #1:

We go to the city often. Our anticipation fills us as we see the skyscrapers come into view. We allow ourselves to explore every corner, never letting an attraction escape us. Our voices fill the air and street. We see all the sights, we window shop, and everywhere we go we see our reflections looking back at us in the glass of a hundred windows. At nightfall we linger, our time in the city almost over. When finally we must leave, we do so knowing that we will soon return. The city belongs to us.

Prime #2:
I go to the city often. My anticipation fills me as I see the skyscrapers come into view. I allow myself to explore every corner, never letting an attraction escape me. My voice fills the air and street. I see all the sights, I window shop, and everywhere I go I see my reflection looking back at me in the glass of a hundred windows. At nightfall I linger, my time in the city almost over. When finally I must leave, I do so knowing that I will soon return. The city belongs to me.

Prime #3:

It goes to the city often. Its anticipation fills it as it sees the skyscrapers come into view. It allows itself to explore every corner, never letting an attraction escape it. Its voice fills the air and street. It sees all the sights, it window shops, and everywhere it goes, it sees its reflection looking back at it in the glass of a hundred windows. At nightfall it lingers, its time in the city almost over. When finally it must leave, it does so knowing that it will soon return. The city belongs to it.
Appendix C

Measure of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements:

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Horizontal Individualism (H-I)

I often do “my own thing”.
One should live one’s life independently of others.
I like my privacy.
I prefer to be direct and forthright when discussing with people.
I am a unique individual.
What happens to me is my own doing.
When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.
I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.

Vertical Individualism (V-I)
It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.

Competition is the law of nature.

When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.

Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society.

Winning is everything.

It is important that I do my job better than others.

I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.

Some people emphasize winning; I’m one of them.

Horizontal Collectivism (H-C)

The well-being of my co-workers is important to me.

If a co-worker gets a prize, I would feel proud.

If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.

It is important to maintain harmony within my group.

I like sharing little things with my neighbors.

I feel good when I cooperate with others.

My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.

To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

Vertical Collectivism (V-C)

I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it.

I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity.

Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends.
I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.
Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.
I hate to disagree with other in my group.
We should keep our aging parents with us at home.
Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award.
Appendix D

Family Allocentrism-Idiocentrism Scale

You are asked to rate yourself by indicating the extent to which each statement is characteristic or uncharacteristic of you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Moderately Uncharacteristic</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Moderately Characteristic</th>
<th>Extremely Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am very similar to my parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I work hard to please my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I follow my concerns or goals even if it makes my family unhappy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would be honored by my family’s accomplishments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My ability to relate to my family is a sign of my competence as a mature person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Once you get married your parents should no longer be involved in major life choices.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The opinions of my family are important to me.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Knowing that I need to rely on my family makes me happy.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I will be responsible for taking care of my aging parents.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. My happiness depends on the happiness of my family.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. If a family member fails, I feel responsible.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Even when away from home, I should consider my family’s values.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. I would feel uneasy and not comfortable if I told my family “no” when they asked me to do something.  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. I have many duties and obligations in my family.

15. There are a lot of differences between me and other members of my family.

16. I think it is important to get along with my family at all costs.

17. I should not say what is on my mind in case it upsets my family.

18. My needs are not the same as my family’s.

19. After I leave my parent’s house, I am not accountable to them.

20. I respect my parents wishes even if they are not my own.

21. It is important to feel independent of one’s own family.
Appendix E

Self-Construal Scale

INSTRUCTIONS
This is a questionnaire that measures a variety of feelings and behaviors in various situations. Listed below are a number of statements. Read each one as if it referred to you. Using the following scale, indicate the number that best matches your agreement or disagreement. Thank you.

1=STRONGLY DISAGREE  4=DON’T AGREE OR  5=AGREE SOMEWHAT
2=DISAGREE            6=AGREE
3=SOMewhat DISAGREE     7=STRONGLY AGREE

____1. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
____2. I can talk openly with a person who I meet for the first time, even when this person is much older than I am.
____3. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
____4. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
____5. I do my own thing, regardless of what others think.
____6. I respect people who are modest about themselves.
____7. I feel it is important for me to act as an independent person.
____8. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
____9. I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.
____10. Having a lively imagination is important to me.
____11. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans.
____12. I feel my fate is intertwined with the fate of those around me.
____13. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.
____14. I feel good when I cooperate with others.
____15. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
____16. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
____17. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
____18. Speaking up during a class (or a meeting) is not a problem for me.
____19. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor (or my boss).
____20. I act the same way no matter who I am with.
____21. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
____22. I value being in good health above everything.
____23. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group.
24. I try to do what is best for me, regardless of how that might affect others.
25. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
26. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
27. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.
28. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
29. I act the same way at home that I do at school (or work).
30. I usually go along with what others want to do, even when I would rather do something different.