Individualism-Collectivism and Bias Against Outgroup Members

A Literature Review

Tyler Werland

.

This study examines the extent to which individualism-collectivism influence attitudes and behaviors toward outgroup members. Specifically, this research focuses on negative attitudes such as stereotypes, prejudice, favoritism, and negative behaviors such as discrimination and conflict. With the expectation that bias is present when members of both individualistic and collectivistic groups interact with outgroups, this study investigates (a) whether bias is more common in individualistic or in collectivistic groups and (b) the types of bias that are more common in each group.

Keywords: Individualism-Collectivism, intergroup relations, bias, outgroup

I – ANALYSIS

Throughout history, cultures have formed, developed, and expanded over time. Our world is now made up of millions diverse people from many cultures. A way to compare, evaluate, and understand cultural differences is through cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1993). Geert Hofstede and Harry Triandis are well-known researchers due to their work in cross-cultural psychology and sociology. Hofstede (1984) defines culture as, "the collective programming that distinguishes the members of one group or society from those of another" (p. 82). Triandis (1993), on the other hand, describes culture as "shared attitudes, beliefs, categorizations, expectations, norms, roles, self-definitions, values, and other such elements of subjective culture found among individuals whose interactions were facilitated by shared language, historical period, and geographic region"(p.3). Culture plays a significant role in our

everyday lives and has a strong influence on individuals, organizations, countries, and society as a whole.

This study focuses on individualism-collectivism, a dimension among six cultural dimensions introduced by Hofstede (1980). Specifically, this research examines individualistic and collectivistic group members and their interactions with people who do not belong to the same groups (i.e., outgroup members). Although there has been much research on individualism-collectivism (Hofstede, 1980, 1985; Triandis, 1993; Hui & Triandis, 1986), ingroups, and outgroups (Summer, 1906; Allport, 1954, Turner, Brown, and Tajfel, 1979; Brewer, 1999), with some literature discussing the interplay of both (Triandis, 1989; Leung, 1997; Gelfand, Bhawuk, Nishi, & Bechtold, 2004), not much is known about the negative attitudes and behaviors of members of individualistic and collectivistic groups toward outgroup members. In contrast, there have been studies discussing the positive side of collectivism (vs. individualism) regarding cooperative interactions among ingroup members. A study conducted by Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clark (1985) found collectivism is related to cooperation. This finding of the relationship between collectivism and cooperation was supported by subsequent research (Chatman & Barsade,1995; Marcus & Le, 2013). General literature on individualism-collectivism hardly addresses the "dark-side" of individualistic or collectivistic groups regarding interactions with members outside of the ingroup. Here, the "dark-side" refers to the negative bias that can be present when members of these groups interact with outgroups. The bias outcomes that are a result of intergroup interactions were a focus of this study. The differences in the attitudes and behaviors of individualistic groups versus collectivistic groups were observed, compared, and discussed in this thesis. This research brings new contributions to the literature on individualism-collectivism by addressing and acknowledging an understudied perspective of the

2

cultural dimension. The results of this literature review enable us further to compare and understand the potential effect of cultures on interactions with outgroups, while creating a theoretical framework for future studies on the "dark-side" of individualism-collectivism.

In the next section, the positive aspects of individualism-collectivism will be discussed to reveal the opportunities within the literature that this study addressed. Additionally, since individualism-collectivism and ingroups and outgroups play a significant role in this research, the remaining sections will define and expand on each concept. It is essential to understand these terminologies as they serve as the foundation for this study.

Individualism-Collectivism

The phenomenon of individualism-collectivism has enabled us to gain a better understanding of cultural differences and is frequently used in social sciences and cross-cultural studies. Individualism-collectivism became popular through the emergence of Hofstede's cultural dimension framework, where Hofstede classified "Individualism-Collectivism" as a cultural dimension (Hofstede, 1980, 1985). Individualism-Collectivism has also been researched by Triandis who identifies individualism-collectivism as a cultural syndrome (Triandis, 1993), with cultural syndromes being a group of elements of subjective culture centralized around a common theme. Triandis believes that individualism-collectivism fits the specific criteria to form a cultural syndrome which is as follows:

"(a) there are correlations among the elements of subjective culture that are organized around a theme (b) there is less variance in these elements of subjective culture within than between cultures (c) there is covariation between geographical regions and subjective culture" (p.158).

3

While Hofstede and Triandis had alternate viewpoints on of individualism-collectivism, both researchers agreed on the fundamentals of the cultural concept.

Individualism. The central idea of individualism can be seen in the context of the word itself being the 'individual,' where the individual is the primary focus. Hofstede (1985) defines individualism as "a preference for a loosely knit framework in society in which individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families only" (p. 348). Individualists value independence, self-sufficiency, and believe everyone should take care of themselves (Hui and Triandis 1986). Members of individualistic cultures can be competitive, seek control, and continuously strive to achieve their individual goals.

Collectivism. The primary focus of collectivism is opposite to that of individualism with a strong emphasis on the group rather than the individual. Hofstede (1985), defines collectivism as "a preference for a tightly knit social framework in which individuals can expect their relatives, clan, or other in-group to look after them, in exchange for unquestioning loyalty" (p. 348). Collectivism, also studied by Hui and Triandis (1986), can be defined as a combination of the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of a wide range of individuals. Collectivists value interdependence, maintaining social relationships, and are attached to their ingroups. Unlike members of individualistic groups, collectivistic groups will put the goals of the group above the purposes of the individual and find satisfaction in having a sense of belonging.

Levels of Individualism-Collectivism. It is essential to understand the levels that individualism-collectivism can be measured. The lowest level being the individual, and the highest level being society, while an organization can exist between the other two. It is also worth noting that there is and can be overlap across the three levels discussed. Triandis (1993), highlights this interaction best, stating, "Most cultures include a mixture of individualistic and

4

collectivist elements, and most individuals include in their cognitive systems both patterns" (p. 159). For example, an individual can have collective qualities while working in an individualistic organization and living in an individualistic country. There are positive and negative sides to individualism-collectivism.

Positive Side of Individualism-Collectivism

Cooperation among group members has been found to be closely related to collectivism at all levels of analysis (Marcus and Le, 2013). This finding highlights the significance of studying individualism-collectivism in organizational research as cooperation is proven to be an essential component of organizational success (Barnard, 1938). Other research also suggests there is a relationship between allocentrism and collectivism (Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clark, 1985), connecting allocentric values of cooperation and equality to collectivism. This relationship was further supported by a study conducted by Chatman and Barsade (1995), who assessed MBA students' disposition to cooperate through a business simulation where organizations either emphasized collectivistic or individualistic values. Results of this study revealed that subjects in collectivistic cultures were highly rated as cooperative. This relationship was later observed by Marcus & Le (2013), who conducted a meta-analysis examining the interactive effects of individualism-collectivism on cooperation. Results of the meta-analysis included a strong correlation between societal-level and organizational-level individualism-collectivism and cooperation for collectivistic organizations and societies.

Bias and Ingroups/Outgroups

Ingroups and Outgroups. Early origins of ingroups and outgroups derived from Sumner (1906) but were further expanded on by Allport (1954) who introduced the concept of ingroup formation. Allport aligns the term 'we', closely with ingroups whose members have the same

consciousness. Intergroup relations have since been discussed and examined in literature (Turner, Brown, & Tajfel, 1979; Brewer, 1999). When an individual is able to acknowledge themselves as a part of an ingroup, an outgroup is likely to coexist. Outgroup status can be determined by the perceptions that ingroup members have toward those who they do not identify as a part of their ingroup. These distinctions may be a result of a lack of trust or tension between individuals or groups (Triandis, 1989). To give an example of an ingroup and outgroup, take a prideful student of the University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) who loves his university. This student, along with other loyal UTSA students can make up an ingroup. An outgroup in this scenario could be UTSA's rival Texas State University (this example could be applied to any college rivalry).

  Social Identity Theory. Henri Tajfel (1974) expanded on the formation of groups through the development of the Social Identity Theory. He defined social identity as a part of an individual's self-concept which originates from an individual's membership of a social group, combined with the emotional attachment to that group. Social identity is an important concept as it can explain why groups form. Another critical theory which deviated from social identity is social categorization which can be considered "a system of orientation which creates and defines the individual's place in society" (p.69). Social Identity Theory is relevant to this research as it justifies the existence of ingroups among both individualistic and collectivistic groups, suggesting that as individuals, we identify ourselves with groups. On the other hand, the concept of social categorization suggests that individuals can distinguish groups from one another which gives reason to why outgroups formed. The comparative perspective and perceptual differences between ingroups and outgroups present the opportunity for bias.

Bias Toward Outgroups. Bias can exist when a group sees members of their ingroup more positive compared to outgroup members (Mullen, Brown, & Smith 1992; Crocker & Luthanen 1990), or when given the choice will show preference toward their ingroup (Turner, 1979; Brewer, 1999; Brewer & Chen, 2007). Allport (1954) noted that positive preference for ingroup does not automatically imply negativity toward outgroups but acknowledges that ingroup favoritism can be compatible with attitudes on a spectrum of love and hate. Brewer (1999) explains that discrimination between ingroup and outgroups is a matter of favoritism toward the ingroup and a lack of favoritism toward outgroups. Although intergroup interactions can lead to cooperative practices, if ingroup favoritism is exhibited, bias attitudes and behaviors may arise. There is an apparent difference in the way ingroups views their members compared to outgroup members which is why it is important we study those relationships.

As discussed earlier, past research has established the positive side of collectivism (versus individualism) regarding cooperation among ingroup members. This paper attempts to investigate the "dark-side" of this cultural dimension. Purposely, this review of literature examines the extent to which members of individualistic and collectivistic groups differ in bias toward outgroup members.

Both individualistic and collectivistic groups distinguish between ingroups and outgroups and engage in ingroup favoritism, suggesting that both groups can display bias. The concept of ingroup favoritism has been noted in both collectivistic groups (Leung & Bond, 1984) and individualistic groups (Brewer & Chen 2007), supporting the idea that both groups can perceive others as outgroup members. Both individualistic and collectivistic groups also appear to show a lack interest in outgroup members. Schwartz (1990) suggests that collectivists show less consideration for the welfare of strangers which can explain why collectivistic groups are

7

primarily concerned with their ingroup. Similarly, individualistic groups are known to be self-centered, so naturally they will show less concern for others in general (Hui & Triandis, 1986). As such, both collectivistic and individualistic groups can exhibit ingroup favoritism and show less concern for members of the outgroup. Though observations of ingroup favoritism and lack of concern for others was noted in both individualistic and collectivistic groups, past research does discuss the extent and frequency at which they display bias toward outgroup members, leading to the following question:

R1: Is bias more common in individualistic groups or collectivistic groups?

Bias against outgroup members is likely a result of the differences in communication styles, conflict resolution tactics, and social attitudes and behaviors among individualistic and collectivistic groups. Examples of bias include, but are not limited to attitudes such as prejudice, stereotypes, and favoritism, and behaviors such as, discrimination and conflict. When observing the differences in communication styles, collectivistic groups often communicate indirectly and are avoidant, whereas individualistic groups communicate directly and do not shy away from confrontation (Gelfand et al., 2004). In response to conflict, Ohbuchi, Fukushima, and Tedeschi (1999) revealed that collectivists value maintaining relationships with others, while individualists will seek justice to resolve a conflict. Triandis (1989) discussed the influence that individualism-collectivism has on social behavior in ingroups and outgroups revealing that differences are present. In regard to dissimilarities in attitudes, with collectivistic groups, there is a stronger distinction between ingroup and outgroup members compared to individualistic groups (Triandis, 1989, 1993; Gelfand et al., 2004). Although there are fewer distinctions between ingroup and outgroup members for individualistic groups, individualistic groups are still capable of distinguishing between ingroups and outgroups similar to the way collectivistic groups do.

Differences in behaviors can be demonstrated by collectivists willingness to sacrifice themselves for their group (Triandis, 2001), an act in which individualists would be hesitant to partake in. On the other hand, in a dispute, individualists are willing to go to court to solve an issue (Leung, 1997), whereas collectivists may not want to jeopardize relationships like that. Given these notable differences between individualistic and collectivistic groups, concurrently, there should be a variation in the types of bias linked to each group, suggesting the second question for this study:

R2: Do collectivistic and individualistic group members engage in different types of bias (e.g., attitudes and behaviors) against outgroup members?

To answer the two questions, a search of empirical research studies was conducted to gather critical information to address the topics at hand. This literature was further analyzed to discover pertinent themes that would help shed lights on these questions. The following sections describe the search and selection process.

II – LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature Search

An electronic literature search was carried out using databases within EBSCOhost. The specific databases used included: Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, Communication & Mass Media Complete, MasterFILE Premier, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, SocINDEX with Full Text, and Communication Abstracts Primary. The terms used for the search were (individualism-collectivism OR individualism OR collectivism) AND (ingroup OR outgroup OR intergroup) AND (bias OR discrimination OR favoritism OR stereotypes OR prejudice OR conflict).

Selection Criteria

The studies that surfaced as a result of the search, were then analyzed for trends that were relevant toward the research questions. Articles were reviewed by the following criteria:

- Must include an individualistic or collectivistic group (or both).

- Members of the individualistic or collectivistic group are referred to or suggested to be members of an ingroup.

- There is a clear outgroup or outgroup members are identified when the ingroup is an individualistic or collectivistic group.

- There is an attempt to measure attitudes or behaviors towards an outgroup member.

Selection Process

Using the search terms and databases previously discussed within EBSCOhost, the search resulted in a total of forty articles. In the initial review, abstracts were read to gain a general understanding of the studies. Following the initial review, articles were then explored for the discussion of individualism-collectivism, and intergroup relationships and interactions. In conclusion of the original investigation, ten articles were accepted, and twenty-five articles were rejected, with five articles being marked as, 'needing further examination.' After reconsidering the five articles marked for further examination, two of them were accepted. The accepted articles were revisited to confirm relevance, and the twenty-eight rejected articles were reviewed to ensure valuable studies were not missed.

Description of Selected Articles

After analyzing and reviewing the literature which populated the search, twelve articles were accepted and used for this qualitative study. Details of all the articles from the search (including articles not selected) and reasons for inclusion or exclusion are available in Appendix A. All of the articles selected were relatively current as far as timeframes, as the range of dates

were between 1993 and 2016. Many of the authors specialized in social psychology, intergroup relations, or identity. Additionally, most of these articles were published in journals focused on social psychology, cross-cultural psychology, and intercultural relations. Appendix B and C provide general information on the accepted articles along with brief summaries. Table 1 presents the evaluation of methodologies, participants, and measures of individualism-collectivism, ingroups and outgroups, and bias.

Methodologies. The studies observed in the review included both quantitative and qualitative methods. Eleven of the articles included studies which utilized questionnaires, (Oyserman, 1993; Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz, 1993; Kelly & Kelly, 1994; Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996; Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Chow, Deng, & Ho, 2000). While the majority of the studies utilized quantitative measures, three studies included open-ended responses (Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz, 1993; Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). Lastly, one of the studies conducted was primarily qualitative as interviews were utilized to collect data (de Vries, 2002).

Participants. Sample sizes ranged from 119 to 8, 652 per study. Age of participants varied, some not observed, but the participants of the studies included adolescents, college students, and adults.

Measuring Individualism-Collectivism. Nine studies included Americans (Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz, 1993; Chow et al., 2000; Forbes & et al., 2011; Schröder, Rogers, Ike, Mell, & Scholl., 2013) or Dutch (Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996; Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006; Figueiredo, Doosje, & Valentim, 2016) as the individualistic groups. In contrast, three studies used the Chinese (Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996; Chow et al., 2000; Forbes & et al., 2011) for collectivistic groups which were the most common country high in collectivism

observed in this review. Most of the studies included both individualistic and collectivistic groups, but two studies primarily discussed and evaluated a collectivistic group (Kelly & Kelly, 1994; Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996).

In terms of measures. Eight studies utilized or referenced an Individualism-Collectivism Scale to determine if a particular group was high in individualism or high in collectivism. Alternative measures of individualism-collectivism included a collectivist orientation scale (Brown, 1992) and collective self-esteem scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Most uniquely, Verkuyten & Martinovic (2006) utilized a communalism and individualism scale where communalism was closely related to collectivism. Similarly, Figueiredo, Doosje, & Valentim, (2016), found a correlation between contextualism and collectivism, arguing high contextualism corresponds with high collectivism. Two studies did not test for individualism-collectivism. Instead, they identified the groups as either highly collectivistic or highly individualistic and referenced Hofstede (Forbes et al., 2011; Schröder et al., 2013).

Operationalizing ingroups and outgroups. There was a lot of variation in the methods used to determine group status in the studies used in the literature review. A majority of the studies measured identification, two using social identity (Oyserman, 1993; de Vries, 2002), and three using group identification (Kelly & Kelly, 1994; Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Figueiredo, Doosje, & Valentim, 2016). Three studies predetermined the ingroup and outgroup status of participants (Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz, 1993; Chow et al., 2000; Forbes et al., 2011). One study predetermined the outgroups by presenting various stereotyped groups to participants (Schröder et al., 2013). Lastly, one study assessed friendships and relationships (Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996), and another assessed contextualism which evaluated family, social groups, position in society, and other contexts (Owe et al., 2013).

Measuring bias. None of the studies utilized the same bias measure, but conflict and favorability were the most common across studies. Several studies observed conflict by measuring perceived intergroup conflict (Oyserman, 1993; Kelly & Kelly, 1994) or assessing response to conflict (Forbes & et al., 2011; Figueiredo, Doosje, & Valentim, 2016). Favorability, on the other hand, was measured by favoritism (Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz, 1993; Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; de Vries, 2002), preference (Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996), and evaluation ratings (Schröder & et al., 2013). Bias attitudes were more frequently observed and measured in these studies compared to bias behavior, although, some studies included both.

Individualism-Collectivism and Outgroup Bias

Table 2 presents the result of the analysis on bias outcomes observed in the studies.

Favoritism. Ingroup favoritism appeared to be a common outcome when groups were evaluated on the perception of groups. Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz (1993) tested for in-group-serving bias and out-group-derogating bias in their study of American and Saudi students. Results revealed that the collectivistic students, displayed ethnocentric intergroup bias, favoring their ingroup over the outgroup. Verkuyten and Kwa (1996) found that Chinese youth preferred in-group favoritism and relationships. Additionally, when comparing their group to the individualistic Dutch group, the Chinese evaluated their group as more beneficent. Similarly, Kinket and Verkuyten (1999) measured ingroup favoritism among Turkish children and found that they had a more positive ingroup evaluation when compared to the outgroup. De Vries (2002), found that the collectivistic Indigenous Fijians had a stronger social identity and ingroup identification while the individualistic Indo-Fijians perceived themselves as having a higher status. Owe et al., (2013) established a relationship between contextualism and collectivism and found contextualism to be a strong predictor of ingroup favoritism.

Stereotypes/Discrimination. Both stereotypes and discrimination were only observed in a single study each. Schröder et al. (2013), identified common stereotyped outgroups and participants rated each group in evaluation, potency, and activity. They found that Japan, a collectivistic country, when compared to the United States and Germany, individualistic countries, were more contextualized and outgroups are viewed less positively which supports the findings from Owe et al., (2013). Verkuyten and Martinovic (2006), utilized their scale on perceived discrimination to evaluate the relationship between the Dutch and Turks/Moroccans. They found the collectivistic group of Turks/Moroccans identified strongly with their ingroup and experienced discrimination meaning they felt discriminated against.

Trust/Willingness to share information. Chow et al., (2000) studied workplace interactions of employees from a highly individualistic country, America, and a highly collectivistic country China. The researchers evaluated ingroup and outgroup relationships and behaviors between the two groups specifically, willingness to share information with outgroup members. Chinese employees were found to be less willing to share information with members of the outgroup. Complimentary to these findings, Owe et al. (2013) also found that collectivistic groups were more likely to differentiate in trust between ingroups and outgroups.

Conflict. Conflict was frequently observed in a variety of capacities in multiple studies. Oyserman (1993) conducted three studies that tested the perceived intensity of intergroup conflict and found that intergroup conflict was related to both individualism and collectivism. Kelly and Kelly (1994) not only confirmed a similar relationship between collectivism and perceived conflict but also between relationship collectivism and conflictual behaviors. As previously mentioned, Owe et al. (2013), confirmed that contextualism is a facet of collectivism; this relationship was also a strong predictor of corruption which was exhibited in another study

14

that discussed how the collectivistic, indigenous Fijians attempted to overthrow an individualistic government (de Vries, 2002). Studies conducted by Forbes et al. (2011) and Figueiredo et al. (2016) tested participants responses to conflict. Forbes revealed that men from individualistic societies are more likely to respond to conflict aggressively compared to collectivistic societies. On the other hand, Figueiredo, Doosje, and Valentim found a relationship between ingroup self-investment and exonerating cognitions and collectivism, arguing that those of the collective will be more defensive when confronted.

III – THESIS STATEMENT & ANALYSIS

Research Question 1: Which group exhibits more bias? As seen in Table 2, among the studies that showed bias to be present in both individualistic and collectivistic groups, majority revealed that the collectivistic group displayed stronger bias or exhibited bias more frequently. Al-Zahrani and Kaplowitz (1993) and Figueiredo, Doosje, and Valentim (2016) revealed that collectivistic groups tend to have stronger ingroup bias. Similarly, Schröder et al. (2013) discussed collectivistic groups being less in favor of other ingroups in comparison to individualistic groups. Owe et al. (2013) found that collectivistic groups had not only a stronger ingroup preference but also a higher level of intergroup differentiated trust and corruption. Although Oyserman (1993) found intergroup conflict to be common in both individualistic and collectivistic groups, it appeared to be more likely to happen in collectivistic groups as in one of the studies there was a no relationship between individualism and perceived conflict. These are consistent with previous research which argues that collectivistic groups make stronger distinction between ingroups and outgroups (Triandis, 1989, 1993; Gelfand et al., 2004). One study did counter these inferences, as Kinket and Verkuyten (1999) found that individualistic

Dutch children were more in favor of their ingroup and viewed the outgroup as less positive compared to the collectivistic Turks.

Research Question 2: Differences in types of bias (attitudes or behaviors). There did not appear to be a difference in the bias attitudes expressed by both individualistic and collectivistic groups, as both groups consistently and similarly exhibited bias attitudes whenever an attitude was tested. Unlike attitudes, when behavior was examined, there were notable differences. For example, Forbes et al. (2011) evaluated conflict responses of individualistic and collectivistic participants and found that individualists responded to conflict with aggression whereas the collectivists responded with conflict-reducing behaviors. These findings align with previous research that suggest members of individualists are confrontational (Gelfand et al., 2004) and collectivists are cooperative (Triandis et al., 1985; Chatman & Barsade, 1995; Marcus & Le, 2013) and value relationships with others (Ohbuchi et al., 1999). Coexisting in this review, the notion that collectivistic group members are cooperative, and relationship orientated is supported in one study, but disputed in another. Chow et al. (2000) judged employees' willingness to share knowledge and found that collectivist Chinese were much less likely to share information with outgroup members. This negative behavior displayed by collectivistic group members goes against the cooperative behaviors discussed in prior research.

All of the selected articles measured or referenced individualism-collectivism and observed interactions or perceptions between ingroup and outgroup members. Most importantly, these studies examined the adverse outcomes that can arise from the interplay of individualism-collectivism and outgroup relationships. Research Question 1 compared individualistic groups and collectivistic groups when the bias was observed in both. Although eight studies took note of the presence of bias in both individualistic groups and collectivistic groups, five studies

discussed the differences in bias between the two groups, revealing variations in the frequency or extent to which each group displayed bias. Research Question 2 looked at the differences in the types of bias that are associated with individualistic and collectivistic groups. These differences were only able to be observed through the studies which measured bias in both individualistic and collectivistic groups and discussed the variances between them. Overall, the selected articles for this literature review were able to address and answer both research questions that were presented while revealing other notable themes.

Socio-economic Status/Power Distance and Individualism-Collectivism

It seems individualism-collectivism influences bias attitudes and behaviors toward outgroup members, but socio-economic status and power distance may influence bias as well. This relationship can be observed in a few studies when the collectivistic group which displayed bias toward an outgroup, had a minority status (Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996; Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; de Vries, 2002; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006). Interestingly enough, Kinket & Verkuyten found, "a positive association between identification and ingroup favoritism was observed for both Dutch and Turkish pupils in a numerical minority position, (p.234). This suggests that both individualistic and collectivistic groups are likely to show bias when put in a minority position. Complimentary to those in a minority status, those of a higher status are likely to experience bias from someone of a lower rank which can be observed when employees expressed conflictual attitudes and behaviors toward management (Kelly & Kelly, 1994) and when the Indigenous Fijians attempted to overthrow the Indo-Fijian led government (de Vries, 2002).

Individualism-Collectivism and Outgroup Cooperation

Although bias attitudes and behaviors were observed in both individualistic and collectivistic groups, this was not the case for all perceptions and interactions. Both individualistic and collectivistic displayed cooperation with outgroups in some capacity through out-group serving bias (Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz, 1993), multiculturalism (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006), or conflict-reducing behaviors (Forbes et al., 2011). In many of the positive relationships observed in these studies, outgroup friendship appeared to influence these relationships. De Vries (2002) even suggests, "non-threatening intergroup contact and intergroup friendship opportunities reduces intergroup tension, (p. 324)." In another study adopting teamwork approaches and bonding, opportunities are suggested to reduce differences in group status (Chow et al., 2000). Lastly, the more an individual felt a bond or had a friendship an outgroup member, the more they felt group-based emotions and endorsed the concept of multiculturalism (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006; Figueiredo et al., 2016).

Limitations

Through this literature review, the selected articles suggested bias outcomes as a result of perceptions and interactions with outgroup members in both individualistic and collectivistic groups. These studies resulted from a relatively comprehensive search of the literature, thus representing our current understanding regarding a negative side of individualism-collectivism, however, several limitations should be noted. Firstly, bias attitudes were more frequently observed than bias behaviors. Since bias attitudes were tested more, this may justify why bias was displayed more regularly in collectivistic groups compared to individualistic. Compared to the other articles that measured conflict, Forbes et al. (2011) was the only study that measured response to conflict with a behavior. Bias behaviors were not as frequently studied which limits the study overall as it primarily gives awareness to bias attitudes. Secondly, I observed bias

within the methods of two studies. When reviewing the samples in the studies conducted by Kelly and Kelly (1994) and Verkuyten and Kwa (1996), it can easily be noted that there far more collectivistic participants and fewer individualistic participants. Both studies appear to disregard the individualistic viewpoint causing there to be more bias measured among collectivistic groups in this review.

IV – CONCLUDING REMARKS

After thoroughly analyzing the accepted articles, bias appeared to be a result of the perceptions and interactions with outgroups for both, individualistic and collectivistic groups. Now, in regard to my first research question, bias appeared to be more common among collectivistic groups than individualistic groups. Specifically, when most studies showed that bias was present among both groups, four out of five studies revealed that bias was stronger in collectivistic groups. My second research question focuses on differences in the types of bias associated within individualism-collectivism. This review of literature indicates that bias attitudes appeared to be displayed correspondingly among individualistic and collectivistic groups. On the other hand, there were notable differences between individualistic and collectivistic groups in bias behaviors, explicitly when responding to conflict and sharing information with an outgroup member. These findings overall support previous research on individualism-collectivism, but also reveal inconsistencies in the literature on cooperation and collectivism.

Future Studies

To strengthen the findings observed in this qualitative literature review, further research should utilize quantitative methods such as a meta-analysis to address these questions. Additionally, this literature review only captured twelve articles, so future researchers should

explore and utilize more databases to give more depth to this specific topic of study. Other keywords that can be used in future studies should include 'trust' and 'corruption' as these were two terms, not used in the electronic literature search for this review but were observed in the selected studies. Knowing that individualism-collectivism appears to influence bias outcomes in intergroup relationships, it may also be worth exploring other cultural dimension that may influence bias outcomes as well. Regarding power distance and socio-economic status, future studies should moderate that relationship as collectivistic groups studied in this review was primarily described as the minority group and the individualistic group was often defined as the majority group. Lastly, it may be interesting to look into the causes of these bias outcomes as past interactions seemed to play in why some groups displayed bias toward an outgroup. Nevertheless, cross-cultural research should continue to observe individualism-collectivism and the bias outcomes that can surface from the perceptions and interactions with outgroup members.

Final Thoughts

The purpose of this study was to address the "dark-side" of individualism-collectivism and this literature review successfully did that. With twelve articles reviewed and discussed, it was clear that individualism-collectivism influenced bias outcomes that came from perceptions and interactions with outgroup members. Key findings included bias being more frequently observed through collectivism, but still observed in individualism. Another major find was the prominent differences in bias behaviors among individualistic and collectivistic groups. Most notable, the inconsistencies in the behaviors of collectivists in group interactions. Overall, these findings contribute to the literature on individualism-collectivism by addressing the outcomes that are a result of intergroup relationships. Future studies should continue to observe these relationships while also looking into other cultural influences such as power distance.

20

V – REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.

Al-Zahrani, S. S. A., & Kaplowitz, S. A. (1993). Attributional biases in individualistic and collectivistic cultures: A comparison of Americans with Saudis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 223-233.

Barnard, C. (1938). The functions of the executive. *Cambridge/Mass.*

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate?. *Journal of social issues*, *55*(3), 429-444.

Brewer, M. B., & Chen, Y. R. (2007). Where (who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Review*, *114*(1), 133.

Brown, R., Hinkle, S., Ely, P. G., Fox-Cardamone, L., Maras, P., & Taylor, L. A. (1992). Recognizing group diversity: Individualist-collectivist and autonomous-relational social orientations and their implications for intergroup processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*(4), 327-342.

Chow, C. W., Deng, F. J., & Ho, J. L. (2000). The openness of knowledge sharing within organizations: A comparative study of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *12*(1), 65-95.

Chatman, J. A., & Barsade, S. G. (1995). Personality, organizational culture, and cooperation: Evidence from a business simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 423-443.

Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *58*(1), 60.

De Vries, R. E. (2002). Ethnic tension in paradise: explaining ethnic supremacy aspirations in Fiji. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *26*(3), 311-327.

Figueiredo, A., Doosje, B., & Valentim, J. P. (2015). Group-based compunction and anger: their antecedents and consequences in relation to colonial conflicts. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, *9*(1), 91.

Forbes, G. B., Collinsworth, L. L., Zhao, P., Kohlman, S., & LeClaire, J. (2011). Relationships among individualism–collectivism, gender, and ingroup/outgroup status, and responses to conflict: A study in China and the United States. *Aggressive behavior*, *37*(4), 302-314.

Gelfand, M. J., Bhawuk, D. P., Nishii, L. H., & Bechtold, D. J. (2004). Individualism and collectivism. *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of*, *62*, 437-512.

Hofstede, G (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values.* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific journal of management*, *1*(2), 81-99.

Hofstede, G. (1985). The interaction between national and organizational value systems [1]. *Journal of Management Studies*, *22*(4), 347-357.

Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, *17*(2), 225-248.

Kinket, B., & Verkuyten, M. (1999). Intergroup evaluations and social context: A multilevel approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*(2-3), 219-237.

Kelly, C., & Kelly, J. (1994). Who gets involved in collective action?: Social psychological determinants of individual participation in trade unions. *Human relations*, *47*(1), 63-88.

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1984). The impact of cultural collectivism on reward allocation. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, *47*(4), 793.

Leung, K. (1997). Negotiation and reward allocations across cultures In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), New perspectives on international industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 640–675) San Francisco: Lexington Press.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, *18*(3), 302-318.

Marcus, J., & Le, H. (2013). Interactive effects of levels of individualism–collectivism on cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*(6), 813-834.

Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *22*(2), 103-122.

Ohbuchi, K. I., Fukushima, O., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Cultural values in conflict management: Goal orientation, goal attainment, and tactical decision. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *30*(1), 51-71.

Owe, E., Vignoles, V. L., Becker, M., Brown, R., Smith, P. B., Lee, S. W., ... & Baguma, P. (2013). Contextualism as an important facet of individualism-collectivism: Personhood beliefs across 37 national groups. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *44*(1), 24-45.

Oyserman, D. (1993). The lens of personhood: Viewing the self and others in a multicultural society. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*(5), 993.

Schröder, T., Rogers, K. B., Ike, S., Mell, J. N., & Scholl, W. (2013). Affective meanings of

stereotyped social groups in cross-cultural comparison. *Group processes & intergroup relations*, *16*(6), 717-733.

Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, *21*(2), 139-157.

Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways,* Ginn, New York.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, *13*(2), 65-93.

Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. I. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in personality*, *19*(4), 395-415.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological review*, *96*(3), 506.

Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-cultural research*, *27*(3-4), 155-180.

Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism. *European journal of social psychology*, *9*(2), 187-204.

Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of personality*, *69*(6), 907-924.

Verkuyten, M., & Kwa, G. A. (1996). Ethnic self-identification, ethnic involvement, and group differentiation among Chinese youth in the Netherlands. *The Journal of social psychology*, *136*(1), 35-48.

Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2006). Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*(1), 1-18.

VI – APPENDICES

Appendix A

Complete Literature Review

#	Title	Included/Exluded	Why
1	A self-representation analysis of the effects of individualist–collectivist interactions within organizations in individualistic cultures: Lessons for diversity management		Presents a theoretical model, does not measure or test anything.
2	Affective meanings of stereotyped social groups in cross-cultural comparison		Both individualistic group and collectivistic group display bias, stronger in collectivistic groups.
3	Anxiety and Intergroup R Bias: Terror Management		Although this article mentions individualism-collectivism and intergroup bias, bias toward outgroup members was not measured or tested.
4	Climato-Economic Origins of Variation in Ingroup Favoritism		Although ingroup favoritism is measured in all three different studies, each study fails to measure individualism-collectivism.
5	Conflict and Exclusivity in Early Bronze Age Societies of the Middle Euphrates Valley		Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism or ingroups and outgroups.
6	Conflicting Social Motives in Negotiating Groups		Measures individualism-collectivism on an individual level, but the study focuses on the motives more than the interactions with outgroups.
7	Consanguinity as a Major Predictor of Levels of Democracy: A Study of 70 Nations		Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism.
8	Contextualism as an Important Facet of Individualism-Collectivism: Personhood Beliefs Across 37 National Groups		Collectivistic groups display ingroup favoritism and distrust toward outgroups.
9	Ethnic tension in paradise: explaining ethnic supremacy aspirations in Fiji		The collectivistic group attempted to overthrow individualistic group.
10	Group-based Compunction and Anger: Their Antecedents and Consequences in Relation to Colonial Conflicts		The collectivistic group does not show bias toward outgroup. Argues if individuals feel a bond with the outgroup, will feel stronger emotions about wrongdoings toward the outgroup.
11	I need you, you need me: a model of initiated task interdependence | Journal of Managerial Psychology | Vol 21, No 3		Supports the positive side of collectivism, does not discuss interactions with outgroups.
12	Racism, Marxism, Psychology'		Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism or ingroups and outgroups.
13	Social Relationships and Sexism in the United States and Taiwan		Identifies individualistic and collectivistic group, but not sure if outgroup is explicitly stated.
14	The lens of personhood: Viewing the self and others in a multicultural society		Country endorsed both individualist and collectivists worldviews, with the collectivist worldview being more common.
15	"The Responsibility Is On Us": The Effect of Power Asymmetry on Acknowledgement of Responsibility and Peer Collaboration in Intergroup Conflict Deliberation		Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism.
16	When compliments fail to flatter: American individualism and responses to positive stereotypes		Fails to discuss ingroup and outgroup.
17	White Opposition to Racial Transformation. Is it Racism?		Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism.
18	Who gets involved in collective action?: Social psychological determinants of individual participation in trade unions		The collectivistic group, in this case, showed out-group-derogating bias and intergroup bias favoring their ingroup but not in a negative way.
19	A social mind: The context of John Turner's work and its influence		Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism.
20	Attributional Biases in Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures: A Comparison of Americans with Saudis		Collectivistic group in this case showed out-group-derogating bias and intergroup bias favoring their ingroup but not in a negative way.

#	Title		Notes
21	Camps, conflict and collectivism. (cover story)		Cover story. Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism.
22	Cultural Diversity, Intragroup Conflict, and Group Outcomes: Evidence for a Mediated Relationship		Fails to discuss ingroup and outgroup.
23	Ethnic Self-Identification, Ethnic Involvement, and Group Differentiation Among Chinese Youth in the Netherlands		The collectivistic group displays ingroup favoritism.
24	Hispanic/Latino Identity Labels: An Examination of Cultural Values and Personal Experiences		Although collectivism and discrimination was measured, the outgroup was not clearly defined.
25	Illuminating a cross-cultural leadership challenge: when identity groups collide		Fails to discuss ingroup and outgroup.
26	Intergroup evaluations and social context: a multilevel approach		Fails to discuss ingroup and outgroup. Individualistic group and collectivistic group displayed bias (favoritism) toward an outgroup, but the individualistic group showed more bias.
27	INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT Conference Paper Abstracts		Abstracts, none worth looking into.
28	INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT Conference Paper Abstracts		Abstracts, one to be looked at but could not locate.
29	ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR Conference Paper Abstracts		Abstracts, none worth looking into.
30	Pathogen Prevalence, Group Bias, and Collectivism in the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample		Does not identify an individualistic or collectivistic group.
31	Racial prejudice and social values: how I perceive others and myself		Discusses individualistic and collectivistic groups but does not discuss bias toward outgroups.
32	Relationships among individualism-collectivism, gender, and ingroup/outgroup status, and responses to conflict: a study in China and the United States		The individualistic group displayed bias behavior as a response to conflict. .
33	Social Categorisation in Philippine Organisations: Values Toward Collective Identity and Management Through Intergroup Relations		Fails to discuss ingroup and outgroup.
34	The Effects of Culture and Cohesiveness on Intragroup Conflict and Effectiveness		Although individualism-collectivism and ingroups are observed, there are no interactions with outgroups.
35	The interaction of vertical collectivism and stereotype activation on the performance of Turkish-origin high school students		Fails to discuss interactions with outgroup members.
36	The meaning of crisis		Fails to address individualism-collectivism or ingroups and outgroups.
37	The Openness of Knowledge Sharing within Organizations: A Comparative Study of the United States and the People's Republic of China		The collectivistic group showed a strong bias toward outgroup, individualistic, no bias toward outgroup.
38	Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies		Both individualistic and collectivistic group did not display bias toward outgroup, but the collectivistic group was more interested in interacting with outgroup members.
39	Основные причины конфликтов между подростками в поликультурном классе и их профилактика		Unable to read.
40	New directions in Indian psychology: social psychology, v. 1		Fails to discuss individualism-collectivism.

Appendix B

General Information on Accepted Articles

Article	Year	Journal	Author(s)
The lens of personhood: Viewing the self and others in a multicultural society	1993	*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*	Oyserman
Attributional Biases in Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures: A Comparison of Americans with Saudis	1993	*Social Psychology Quarterly*	Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz
Who gets involved in collective action?: Social psychological determinants of individual participation in trade unions	1994	*Human Relations*	Kelly & Kelly
Ethnic Self-Identification, Ethnic Involvement, and Group Differentiation Among Chinese Youth in the Netherlands	1996	*Journal of Social Psychology*	Verkuyten & Kwa
Intergroup evaluations and social context: a multilevel approach	1999	*European Journal of Social Psychology*	Kinket & Verkuyten
The Openness of Knowledge Sharing within Organizations: A Comparative Study of the United States and the People's Republic of China	2000	*Journal of Management Accounting Research*	Chow, Deng, & Ho
Ethnic tension in paradise: explaining ethnic supremacy aspirations in Fiji	2002	*International Journal of Intercultural Relations*	de Vries
Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies	2006	*International Journal of Intercultural Relations*	Verkuyten & Martinovic
Relationships among individualism-collectivism, gender, and ingroup/outgroup status, and responses to conflict: a study in China and the United States	2011	*Aggressive Behavior*	Forbes, Collinsworth, Zhao, Kohlman, & LeClaire
Affective meanings of stereotyped social groups in cross-cultural comparison	2013	*Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*	Schröder, Rogers, Ike, Mell, & Scholl
Contextualism as an Important Facet of Individualism-Collectivism: Personhood Beliefs Across 37 National Groups	2013	*Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*	Owe, Vignoles, & Becker, et al.
Group-based Compunction and Anger: Their Antecedents and Consequences in Relation to Colonial Conflicts	2016	*International Journal of Conflict and Violence*	Figueiredo, Doosje, & Valentim

Appendix C

Summary of Accepted Articles

Oyserman (1993) conducted four studies on individualism and collectivism in Israel. Utilizing Arab and Jewish Israeli students, revealed that as a society, Israel endorsed both worldviews of individualism and collectivism. Notable similarities and differences were found by hypothesizing and exploring self-concept and social relations among individualism-collectivism.

Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz (1993) compared Saudis and Americans because of their dissimilarities in individualism-collectivism. In their study, participants made attributions about eight different situations which revealed intergroup attitudes and attributional differences. The attributional bias exhibited by both groups were discussed.

Kelly & Kelly (1994) evaluated trade union members and their willingness to take part in union activities. Majority of the participants had a general occupation, while only nine respondents worked in an upper management role. With a strong collectivist orientation and strong group identification, this study primarily gave a collectivistic point of view.

Verkuyten & Kwa (1996) observed adolescents of Chinese minority groups living in a predominantly individualistic society. Specifically, the study explored ethnic self-description and ethnic involvement, while assessing ingroup and outgroup relations. Similar to the study conducted by Kelly & Kelly (1994), this study only gave a collectivist perspective.

Kinket & Verkuyten (1999) gave a multilevel approach toward intergroup relations. They studied ethnic group evaluations of an individualistic group and collectivistic group. Through their contextual social psychological approach, revealed that both individual characteristics and social context determine intergroup evaluations.

Chow, Deng, & Ho (2000) utilized quantitative and open-responses to judge employees' willingness to share knowledge. They explored the influence of national culture and ingroup/outgroup status on interactions in the workplace. The concept of individualism-collectivism was heavily discussed as participants in the study came from societies high in either individualism or collectivism.

De Vries (2002) explored the country of Fiji, a country in which has adopted both cultural worldviews of individualism-collectivism. The ethnic tension between the Indigenous

27

Fijians and the Indo-Fijians was investigated through qualitative means. Differences in ethnic aspirations were revealed along with differences in social identity and socio-economic status.

Verkuyten & Martinovic (2006) examined multiculturalism among adolescents living in the Netherlands. Multiculturalism emphasizes on cultural diversity and was tested in a variety of capacities among the two types of groups observed. Differences between the two groups were discussed, including a measure on individualism-collectivism.

Forbes, Collinsworth, Zhao, Kohlman, & LeClaire (2011) placed participants from either a high individualistic culture or a high collectivistic culture, in conflict situations. Along with cultural differences, gender and ingroup/outgroup status were also examined. The responses to conflict were discussed, comparing cultural and gender differences.

Schröder, Rogers, Ike, Mell, & Scholl (2013) identified multiple stereotyped groups and presented them to participants who rated the affective meaning of the group(s) presented. Participants from individualistic countries of the United States and German, and the collectivistic country of Japan, participated in this study. Emotional experiences were tested and compared across cultures, revealing that the affective meanings appear to reflect social order.

Owe et al. (2013) conducted a cross-cultural study to make contributions to the cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism. The concept of contextualism was proposed as a facet of collectivism. National-level correlations supported the idea that contextualism beliefs compliment those of collectivism. Contextualism was also used as a predictor of group preferences and attitudes toward others.

Figueiredo, Doosje, & Valentim (2016) examined group-based emotions among two countries, Portugal, and the Netherlands. This study analyzed both ingroup and outgroup

variables, while observing behavioral and attitude responses to past conflicts. Overall, revealed

similarities and distinctions in group-based emotions that follow conflict between groups.

Table 1

Article	Number of Studies	Questionnaire (Open-ended)	Interview	College Students	Adults	Total Sample Size	I-C Measured	C Reference	Scale or Reference	Individualistic Group	Collectivistic Group	Individualist Respondents	Collectivist Respondents	Ingroup/Outgroup Measure	Bias Measure	Attitude	Behavior
The lens of personhood: Viewing the self and others in a multicultural society	4	X		X		1,021	X		Individualism-Collectivism; Hui, (1988), Triandis (1988), Triandis, McCusker, & Hui (1988)	Israelis	Israelis			Social identity; Kuhn & McPartland (1954), McGuire & McGuire (1982)	Machiavellianism, and perceived intensity of intergroup conflict; Christie & Geis (1970)	X	
Attributional Biases in Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures: A Comparison of Americans with Saudis	1			X		325	X		Individualism-Collectivism; Triandis et al., (1988)	Americans	Saudis	161	162	Identified ingroup and outgroup	Group favorability; created scale	X	
Who gets involved in collective action?: Social psychological determinants of individual participation in trade unions	1				X	350	X		Collectivist Orientation; Brown (1992)		Union Members		Majority	Group identification; (Brown et al., 1986)	Perceived intergroup conflict; Nicholson et al. (1981)	X	X
Ethnic Self-Identification, Ethnic Involvement, and Group Differentiation Among Chinese Youth in the Netherlands	1	X				119	X		Collectivism; Triandis (1988)	Dutch	Chinese		Majority	(1992), Quattrone & Jones (1980)	Preference of other ethnic groups, beneficence, competence (Smith & Bond, 1993)	X	
Intergroup evaluations and social context: a multilevel approach	1					460	X		Collective Self-Esteem; Luhtanen and Crocker (1992)	Dutch	Turks	278	182	In- and outgroup evaluation; created scale	Ingroup favoritism; created scale	X	
The Openness of Knowledge Sharing within Organizations: A Comparative Study of the United States and the People's Republic of China	1				X	142	X		Individualism-Collectivism; Hofstede (1980), Earley (1993), and Chinese Cultural Connection (1987)	American	Chinese	104	38	Identified ingroup and outgroup	Willingness to share information; created scale		X
Ethnic tension in paradise: explaining ethnic supremacy aspirations in Fiji	1		X			416	X		Collectivism; Hui (1988)	Indo-Fijians	Indigenous Fijians	177	159	Social identity, in-group identification; Augoustinos & Walker (1995), Tajfel (1981), Brown et al. (1986)	Outgroup contact, ethnic favoritism, socio-economic status; Verkuyten (1997), overthrow; stated	X	X
Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies	2	X				722	X		Communalism and Individualism; Katz and Has (1988), Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asia, & Lucca (1988)	Dutch	Turks/Moroc-cans	553	169	Ingroup identification, multigroup ethnic identity; Phinney's (1992)	Perceived discrimination; created scale	X	
Relationships among individualism-collectivism, gender, and ingroup/outgroup status, and responses to conflict: a study in China and the United States	1			X		416		X	Individualism-Collectivism; Hofstede (2005), Oyserman et al. (2002)	American	Chinese	209	207	Identified ingroup and outgroup	Response to Conflict; created scales		X
Affective meanings of stereotyped social groups in cross-cultural comparison	1			X		171		X	Individualism-Collectivism; Hofstede (2001)	American	Japanese	120	51	Identified outgroups; Osgood (1969)	Evaluation, potency, and activity rating of concepts; Heise (2001)	X	
Contextualism as an Important Facet of Individualism-Collectivism: Personhood Beliefs Across 37 National Groups	2				X	13, 893	X		Portrait Values, Self-Construal, Ingroup Collectivism; Schwartz (2007), Gudykunst, et al. (1996), House et al., (2004) Contextualism study 2	Multiple	Multiple			Contextualism; create scales	Contextualism; create scales	X	X
Group-based Compunction and Anger: Their Antecedents and Consequences in Relation to Colonial Conflicts	1			X		280	X		Collectivism; Triandis & Gelfand (1998)	Dutch	Portuguese	184	280	Ingroup self-investment, outgroup identification; Leach et al. (2008), Valentim (2003)	Meta-perceptions, exonerating cognitions, group-based compunction, group-based anger; Roccas et al. (2006), Valentim (2003) Watson et al. (1988)	X	X

Table 2

Article	Bias for Individualistic Group	Bias for Collectivistic Group	Bias Attitude for Individualistic Group	Bias Attitude for Collectivistic Group	Bias Behavior for Individualistic Group	Bias Behavior for Collectivistic Group	Bias Stronger for Individualistic Group	Bias Stronger for Collectivistic Group	Favoritism	Prejudice	Stereotype	Discrimination	Conflict
The lens of personhood: Viewing the self and others in a multicultural society	X	X	X	X				X					X
Attributional Biases in Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures: A Comparison of Americans with Saudis	X	X	X					X	X				
Who gets involved in collective action?: Social psychological determinants of individual participation in trade unions		X		X		X							X
Ethnic Self-Identification, Ethnic Involvement, and Group Differentiation Among Chinese Youth in the Netherlands		X		X					X				
Intergroup evaluations and social context: a multilevel approach	X	X	X	X			X		X				
The Openness of Knowledge Sharing within Organizations: A Comparative Study of the United States and the People's Republic of China		X				X						X	
Ethnic tension in paradise: explaining ethnic supremacy aspirations in Fiji	X	X				X			X				X
Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies	X	X	X	X								X	
Relationships among individualism-collectivism, gender, and ingroup/outgroup status, and responses to conflict: a study in China and the United States	X				X								X
Affective meanings of stereotyped social groups in cross-cultural comparison	X	X	X	X				X			X		
Contextualism as an Important Facet of Individualism-Collectivism: Personhood Beliefs Across 37 National Groups	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X
Group-based Compunction and Anger: Their Antecedents and Consequences in Relation to Colonial Conflicts	X	X	X	X				X					X