



Mirosława Czerniawska*
Białystok University of Technology

Horizontal and vertical “individualism – collectivism” and values

KEYWORDS

mentality, horizontal and vertical
“individualism – collectivism”,
values

ABSTRACT

Mirosława Czerniawska, *Horizontal and vertical “individualism – collectivism” and values*. Culture – Society – Education no. 2(18) 2020, Poznań 2020, pp. 293–309, Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISSN 2300-0422. DOI 10.14746/kse.2020.18.11.2.

The presented study compares a link between two constructs: “individualism – collectivism” and values. The first construct takes into consideration horizontal and vertical orientation (equality and hierarchy respectively) (Triandis). The description of the second construct accounts for nineteen types of values located on two bipolar dimensions: “conservatism – openness to change” and “self-transcendence – self-enhancement” (Schwartz). The question about the relation between types of values and described horizontal and vertical orientations of individualism and collectivism is posed. The sample consists of 368 students. The results show that the differentiation of mentality on the “individualism – collectivism” dimension with its horizontal and vertical orientation is linked to the differentiation of types of values on the “conservatism – openness to change” dimension. After accounting for horizontal “individualism – collectivism” and vertical “individualism – collectivism” and their relation to the second dimension of type of values (“self-transcendence – self-enhancement”) the results are not consistent.

* ORCID: 0000-0001-7311-5915.

Introduction

Culture is defined as a system of meanings and information shared by a group and passed on from generation to generation. It contains objective and subjective elements (Triandis; cf. Matsumoto, Yoo, 2006), which are created and reproduced by individuals who are linked to each other, in order to solve complex social issues (Kashima, 2000; Triandis, 1994). Culture – due to expectations formulated within it – determines a repertoire of desired behaviour (it defines behaviour that is proper in the light of its members), and helps its realisation (Poortinga; cf. Bond, Smith, 1996). Culture provides symbolic information necessary to shape interactions and determine, who You are and what is important. In most general terms, due to culture people may give sense to the world (Kim, Park, 2006).

The characteristic presented above, encourages to think, what cultural differences are in essence. The most important (being an object of numerous empirical studies) dimension of cultural difference is „individualism – collectivism”. For many years, debates have been conducted regarding what this construct is and how to operationalise it. H.C. Triandis (1994, 1996a, 1996b; cf. Czerniawska, 2010) maintains that „individualism – collectivism” constitutes subjective culture, i.e. a specific mentality. Mentality may be reduced to basic elements such as: categories, relations, attitudes, beliefs, aims, attributions, expectations, norms, roles, principles, definitions of the Self, stereotypes, ideals, values, standards (aesthetic, economic, social, political, scientific, religious), theories, myths, ideologies, religions and approved models of behaviour. People make these elements consistent, and organise them according to certain standards. This results in an occurrence of particular syndromes, that emerge as individualism and collectivism. The former is an assortment of the element of subjective culture coherent with the premise that individuals are autonomous beings, while the other – with the premise that the individuals are primarily members of a group. It is a fact, that relations between an individual and a group, yields particular consequences. In individualistic cultures, establishing goals depends on the individual, while relations between group members are loose. People are characterised by a feeling of larger separateness and independence. They display stronger non-conformism, focusing on self, and lesser care for the welfare of others. In collectivistic cultures, the norm is to adjust to the group (e.g. family, tribe, religious group), participation in its actions, and maintaining strong bonds between the members, interdependence, mutual care, loyalty, and agreeing with the opinion of the group (Triandis, 1990, 1995, 2001, 2003; Triandis et al., 1990).

Empirical significance of the „individualism – collectivism” construct had arisen since the publications of G. Hofstede (1980). The author diagnosed ad-

ditional dimensions of cultural mutability. These are as follows: „masculinity – femininity”, uncertainty avoidance, and the power distance. The last of the aforementioned will be examined with much more detailed care due to the issue analysed within the scope of own research. The power distance is referred to the issue of „equality – hierarchy”. G. Hofstede (1991, 2000, 2001) defined it as the degree, in which weaker members of the society (including institutions and organisations in a given country) realise, that power is not spread equally, and they accept the fact. In societies displaying larger power distance, relations between individuals assume a hierarchic orientation, and in societies with small power distance – equal. This in turn determines the character of communication and cooperation between individuals (e.g. participation), as well as, the division of resources (e.g. egalitarianism).

In the 1990s, the power distance contributed to broadening the interpretation of the „individualism – collectivism” dimension. H.C. Triandis and colleagues (Triandis, 1995; Chen et al., 1997; Triandis et al., 1998; Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, Gelfand, 1998) noted the fact, that individualism and collectivism may be considered horizontally and vertically, therefore, focus on equality or hierarchy. The “clash” of these two dimension allowed the authors to define four types of societies where one of the following dominates:

- horizontal individualism – people are autonomous, they shape their independent Self, but perceive themselves as individuals similar to others (the similarity of the Self to broadly perceived others); much emphasis is placed on equality, as they believe that equality is an ideal state of things;
- vertical individualism – people are autonomous, they shape their independent Self, and they have a feeling of separation from the others (the unique nature of the Self in comparison with the others); they put much emphasis on the distance of power and accept inequalities between individuals;
- horizontal collectivism – people acknowledge group identity, and have group feeling, they shape the Self mutually and perceive themselves as an individual similar to others (similarity of the Self the members of own group); large emphasis is placed on equality, however, they only consider members of their group as equal;
- vertical collectivism – people acknowledge group identity, they feel compelled to the group, to serve it, and even to devote themselves to it; they shape their Self collectively, however, retaining the feeling of separation from others (unique Self in comparison to the members of own group); power distance is important; therefore, they accept hierarchy and inequality among the group, as well as, benefits/losses that come with them.

The above mentioned types of societies, should differ in the axiological aspect, therefore, they may be characterised potentially, by the preferences of specific values. The method was noted i.a. by H.C. Triandis (1995, 1996b). Describing the relations between „individualism – collectivism” in a horizontal and a vertical orientations, and the system of values, the author used the theory by S.H. Schwartz (1992, 1996a, 1996b). According to the theory, values are abstract concepts and provide nothing more than general principles that govern the social live, allow to determine priorities, making decisions and choices. Therefore, thinking of values, means considering what is important in life. S.H. Schwartz created a circular model, where values were described in bipolar dimensions:

- conservation – openness to change;
- self-enhancement – self-transcendence.

The former dimension reflects the conflict between striving for stability and cultivating tradition, and striving for change and high valuation of autonomy expressed in independence of thought and action. The second dimension reflects the conflict between focusing on self and on the others. Focus on self is related to promoting own person, striving for domination and directing activities at personal success. Focusing on others requires discarding the egocentric attitude, considering the welfare of the other human being and promoting their well-being (cf. Czerniawska, 2010). A number of defined types of values are included in the aforementioned two bipolar dimension (each type was distinguished on the basis of a particular assortment of values), that reflect the specific kind of needs and motivations. The number of types varied – from 7 to 19 – depending on the version of the constructed model (works on these models lasted more than 30 years).

H.C. Triandis (1995, 1996b) used S.H. Schwartz’ (1992, 1994) model for his analyses, assorted of ten types of values located in two dimensions (as presented above). He formulated a thesis, that the dimension of „conservation – openness to change” is compatible with the „collectivism – individualism” mentality dimension. The dimension of values „self-transcendence – self-enhancement” reflects the essence of the power distance mentality dimension, i.e. „equality – hierarchy.” Collectivists – both horizontal and vertical – are similar in ascribing meaning to types of values located within the conservation pole, i.e. “security” (stability and securing the society, relations with other people and self), “conformity” (ceasing from socially unaccepted impulses or behaviour), and “tradition” (attachment to cultural and religious customs and ideas). However, they differ in their position within the dimension of power distance. Horizontal collectivists ascribe much larger significance to the type of values such as “benevolence” (maintaining and strengthening the well-being of close relatives), while vertical collectivists – to the

type of value related to "power" (control over people and resources). Individualists – both horizontal and vertical – are similar in approving of values localised within the pole of being open to change, i.e. "self-direction" (independence of thought and action), "stimulation" (spurs, novelty, challenge), and "hedonism" (pleasure, sensual gratification). However, they differ in dimension of power distance. Horizontal individualists value "universalism" more (tolerance and protection for every individual and the entire nature), while vertical individualists – „achievement" (skills displayed accordingly with social standards).

S. Oishi et al. (1998; cf. also Cukur et al., 2004) presented results of studies conducted in the United States (using the 10-element Schwartz model), which significantly confirmed the premises of H.C. Triandis (1995). However, they stated that the vertical individualism was more correlated with the "power" type of value, rather than "achievement". Contrary to Triandis' premises, the "power" value type was not correlated with vertical collectivism.

A few years later, C.S. Cukur et al. (2004) repeated the study (using the same research instruments) among three cultural groups: the Turkish, Americans, and Filipinos. It turned out that the relations between indicated constructs were either analogous in three sample groups (therefore, they were of universal character), or specific for these groups (modified by cultural association). Below, the analyses' results on combined samples are shown (cf. Cukur et al., 2004, tab. 1: 626–627). Higher indicators of collectivism (both horizontal and vertical) were related to the greater acceptance of value types associated with the conservation pole, i.e. "conformity", "tradition" and "security". Individualism (both horizontal and vertical) correlated positively with types of values, that would be included in the pole of openness change, i.e. "self-direction", "stimulation", and "hedonism". The dependencies described here were in accordance with H.C. Triandis' assumptions (1995, 1996b). It turned out that the "universalism" value type (self-transcendence pole) correlated not only with horizontal individualism (as assumed), but also with horizontal collectivism. The "benevolence" value type (self-transcendence pole) correlated not only with horizontal collectivism (as assumed), but also with vertical collectivism. The "power" value type (self-enhancement pole) correlated not only with vertical collectivism, but also with vertical individualism. Finally – the "achievement" value type (self-enhancement pole) correlated not only with vertical individualism (as assumed), but also with horizontal collectivism. Considering the results of aforementioned study, one should note, that the variation in the "collectivism – individualism" dimension (both in the vertical and horizontal orientation) reflects the diversity of values in the "conservation – openness" to change dimension. When the

horizontal and the vertical orientation of collectivism are being considered, their relation to the dimension of „self-transcendence – self-enhancement”, the results are not as clear.

In the study, described in the article, the premises of H.C. Triandis were put to the test, regarding the relation between vertical and horizontal “collectivism – individualism”, and the value system. Variable measures were accomplished on a Polish sample. References were made to the latest value model by S.H Schwartz, and the latest instrument for verifying the model was used – PVQ. The author resigned from using abstract value concepts and used statements that described mens’ beliefs. The author distinguished nineteen (not ten) types of values. The newly described types are a detailed description of the previous (Cieciuch, 2013; Schwartz et al., 2017). Below, are the types of values and their definitions (cf. Cieciuch, 2013). In brackets, types of values were presented regarding the previous 10-element model:

1. Self-direction–thought (self-direction) – independence of thought; freedom in pursuit and choice of own ideas and developing own skills; shaping own worldview.
2. Self-direction–action (self-direction) – independence in decision making, and the accomplishing of chosen aims; freedom in choosing actions.
3. Stimulation (stimulation) – mutability, novelty, arousal (description unchanged).
4. Hedonism (hedonism) – pleasure, sensual satisfaction (description unchanged).
5. Achievement (achievement) – personal success reached in accordance with social standards (eliminated from the competency component description).
6. Power–dominance (power) – power over people, maintaining control over people.
7. Power–resources (power) – power over resources, maintaining power over material and social resources.
8. Face (type of value that was not listed in the 10-element model by Schwartz) – maintaining and protection of own public appearance, social status, avoiding humiliation.
9. Security–personal (security) – security in the closest, direct surroundings.
10. Security–societal (security) – security and stability within society.
11. Conformity–rules (conformity) – compliance with the rules, law (also to the formal requirements of persons that hold power).

12. Conformity–interpersonal (conformity) – avoiding harm or unnerving other people.
13. Tradition (tradition) – acceptance and maintaining customs, ideas, and traditions of own culture, religion or family; respect for tradition.
14. Humility (value type not listed in the 10-element model by Schwartz) – accepting the little significance of own place in the world and history.
15. Benevolence–dependability (benevolence) – to be a reliable, trustworthy member of a group.
16. Benevolence–caring (benevolence) – caring for the good of the other members of the group.
17. Universalism–societal concern (universalism) – striving for equality, justice and good for all mankind.
18. Universalism–nature (universalism) – natural environment protection, nature protection.
19. Universalism – tolerance (universalism) – acceptance and understanding for other people who differ from a given person.

Nineteen types of values may still be positioned within two bipolar dimension. Hence, the openness to change pole encompasses value types 1–3, while conservation pole encompasses 9–13; 5–7 value types are a part of self-enhancement pole, while 15–19 value types – of the pole of self-transcendence. The “hedonism” value type (4) is associated with two poles: openness to change, and self-enhancement; the “face” type (8) to two poles: self-enhancement and conservation, while the “humility” value type (14) – also to two poles: conservation and self-transcendence (cf. also Czerniawska, 2018).

Research question and hypotheses

The study presented in the article is dedicated to the analysis of the relation between mentality and a system of values. The study looked for answers, whether it would be possible to diagnose a pool of values, that would be representative of the specifics of individualism and collectivism in a vertical and horizontal orientation. Two theories were considered: by H.C. Triandis (1995, 1996b), who indicated that individualism and collectivism may have horizontal and vertical orientations, as well as, by S.H. Schwartz (1992, 1996a, 1996b), who claimed that types of values are located within two dimensions: “openness to change – conservation”, as well as, “self-transcendence – self-enhancement”. Both theoretical approaches were “configured” and the instruments of both authors were used. The

study uses the latest PVQ-R3 Schwartz scale (cf. Cieciuch, 2013: 27, figure 2), which allows to diagnose nineteen types of values (the previously quoted authors would focus on ten types of values). Formulating hypotheses was led by the work of Cukur et al. (2004).

Hypotheses 1 and 2 are related to the diversity of value types in the “individualism – collectivism” (both horizontal and vertical) dimension), hypotheses 3 and 4 refer to the diversity of value types in vertical and horizontal individualism, while hypotheses 5 and 6 – to the diversity of value types in vertical and horizontal collectivism. In the hypotheses presented below, the existence of positive correlations between indicators of the following variables were assumed (for a better overview, it was presented in table 1):

Table 1. Research hypotheses

Hypothesis	Triandis theory	Schwartz theory	
	Types of mentality	Value types	Poles of value aspects
1	Horizontal individualism Vertical individualism	Self-direction–thought Self-direction–action Stimulation Hedonism (partially this type belongs to the self-enhancement pole)	Openness to change
2	Vertical individualism	Achievement	Self-enhancement
3	Vertical collectivism	Power–dominance Power–resources Fac (partially this type belongs to the conservation pole)	
4	Horizontal collectivism Vertical collectivism	Security–personal Security–societal Tradition Conformity–rules Conformity–interpersonal Humility (partially this type belongs to the self-transcendence pole)	Conservation
5	Horizontal collectivism	Benevolence–dependability Benevolence–caring	Self-transcendence
6	Horizontal individualism	Universalism–nature Universalism–societal concern Universalism–tolerance	

Method

Study group: 368 pedagogy (approximately 50%) and management (approximately 50%) students took part in the research. In both faculties, approximately 80% were women. The age of the study group ranged from 20 to 24 years.

Research instruments. Horizontal and Vertical "Individualism – Collectivism" Questionnaire (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, Gelfand, 1998; cf. Boski, 2009) is assorted of 32 statements (items). The respondent is to determine (on a scale from 1 to 9) to what degree he/she agrees with these statements. The statements are included within four sub-scales (each sub-scale is eight items): horizontal collectivism, vertical collectivism, horizontal individualism, and vertical individualism. The indicator is a sum of eight items.

Schwartz Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ-R3) is assorted of 57 statements (items). The respondent is to determine (ona scale from 1 to 6) to what degree he/she is similar to the person characterised in each statement. On the basis of 57 evaluations, 19 types of values are listed. The indicator of the preference regarding a certain type of value is the average from three items. From the average received from each type of value, one must subtract the average of all (i.e. 57) items. This way, an ipsative indicator of each of 19 types of values for each person is received. The result of the procedure is that a number of indicators have a negative mark (Cieciuch, 2013).

Results

Table 2 presents the average indicators of variables as well as the results of statistical analysis.

Table 2. "Individualism – collectivism" in the horizontal and vertical form, and the types of values – an analysis of relations

Poles of value dimensions		Types of values	Individualism		Collectivism	
			Horizontal $\bar{x}_1 = 52,16$	Vertical $\bar{x}_1 = 41,62$	Horizontal $\bar{x}_1 = 51,06$	Vertical $\bar{x}_1 = 44,11$
1	Openness to change	Self-direction–thought $\bar{x}_1 = 1,94$	$r = 0,34$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,36$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,03$ n.s.	$r = 0,01$ n.s.
2		Self-direction–action $\bar{x}_1 = 0,50$	$r = 0,22$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,24$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,04$ n.s.	$r = -0,05$ n.s.
3		Stimulation $\bar{x}_1 = -0,81$	$r = 0,35$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,23$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,09$ n.s.	$r = -0,06$ n.s.

4	Self-enhancement	Hedonism $\bar{x}_1 = 2,83$	$r = 0,37$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,09$ n.s.	$r = 0,09$ n.s.	$r = -0,03$ n.s.
5		Achievement $\bar{x}_1 = 1,73$	$r = 0,39$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,16$ $p = 0,002$	$r = 0,16$ $p = 0,002$	$r = 0,01$ n.s.
6		Power–dominance $\bar{x}_1 = 1,01$	$r = 0,07$ n.s.	$r = -0,12$ $p = 0,015$	$r = 0,39$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,18$ $p = 0,000$
7		Power–resources $\bar{x}_1 = -2,24$	$r = 0,03$ n.s.	$r = -0,06$ n.s.	$r = 0,31$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,14$ $p = 0,005$
8	Conservation	Fac $\bar{x}_1 = 1,19$	$r = 0,02$ n.s.	$r = -0,13$ $p = 0,010$	$r = 0,45$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,23$ $p = 0,000$
9		Security–personal $\bar{x}_1 = 3,61$	$r = 0,07$ n.s.	$r = -0,06$ n.s.	$r = 0,30$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,24$ $p = 0,000$
10		Security–societal $\bar{x}_1 = 4,08$	$r = 0,14$ $p = 0,006$	$r = -0,07$ n.s.	$r = 0,36$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,17$ $p = 0,001$
11		Tradition $\bar{x}_1 = -1,18$	$r = 0,04$ n.s.	$r = -0,08$ n.s.	$r = 0,33$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,28$ $p = 0,000$
12	Self-transcendence	Conformity–rules $\bar{x}_1 = -0,69$	$r = -0,04$ n.s.	$r = -0,17$ $p = 0,001$	$r = 0,26$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,25$ $p = 0,000$
13		Conformity–inter-personal $\bar{x}_1 = -1,33$	$r = -0,06$ n.s.	$r = -0,14$ $p = 0,008$	$r = 0,33$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,28$ $p = 0,000$
14		Humility $\bar{x}_1 = 0,99$	$r = -0,02$ n.s.	$r = -0,11$ $p = 0,030$	$r = 0,32$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,33$ $p = 0,000$
15		Benevolence–de- pendability $\bar{x}_1 = 0,93$	$r = 0,08$ n.s.	$r = 0,07$ n.s.	$r = 0,26$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,19$ $p = 0,000$
16	Benevolence–caring $\bar{x}_1 = 1,49$	$r = 0,01$ n.s.	$r = 0,04$ n.s.	$r = 0,22$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,25$ $p = 0,000$	
17	Universalism–nature $\bar{x}_1 = -2,32$	$r = 0,20$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,43$ $p = 0,000$	$r = -0,16$ $p = 0,002$	$r = -0,00$ n.s.	
18	Universalism– societal concern $\bar{x}_1 = 1,77$	$r = 0,19$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,15$ $p = 0,004$	$r = 0,09$ n.s.	$r = 0,12$ $p = 0,020$	
19	Universalism–tolerance $\bar{x}_1 = -4,83$	$r = 0,26$ $p = 0,000$	$r = 0,42$ $p = 0,000$	$r = -0,15$ $p = 0,004$	$r = -0,01$ n.s.	

r – Pearson correlation coefficient

p – statistical significance level

n.s. – correlation coefficient which is statistically irrelevant

Source: own research.

1. Relations (positive and statistically significant correlations) were noted between the pole of openness to change values – which includes such types of values as “self-direction–thought”, “self-direction–action” and “stimulation” – and horizontal and vertical individualism. The stronger the horizontal and vertical

individualism, the larger acceptance for the aforementioned types of values. The given dependencies are in accordance with hypothesis 1. In case of the “hedonism” value, a relation was noted (positive and statistically significant correlation) with horizontal individualism, which is in accordance with hypothesis 1. However, this type of value was not related to vertical individualism, which is not in accordance with hypothesis 1. The last of described dependencies seems surprising, as “hedonism” is a type of value not only associated to openness to change, but also to the self-enhancement pole. Therefore – similar to the “achievement” value type – it should be associated with vertical individualism.

2. “Achievement” value type – included in the self-enhancement pole – correlated positively and statistically significantly with vertical individualism. The dependency was predicted in hypothesis 2. Such correlations were also noted in the case of horizontal individualism and horizontal collectivism, which was not apprehended in the indicated hypothesis.

3. Types of values included in the self-enhancement pole – “power–dominance”, “power–resources” and “fac” – correlated positively and statistically significantly with vertical collectivism. Received results allow to confirm hypothesis 3. However, correlations of these values with horizontal collectivism are inconsistent with the hypothesis. The “power–dominance” and “fac” (“fac” is a type of value partially associated with the conservation pole) value types correlated negatively with vertical individualism, which was also not included in hypothesis 3.

4. Types of values within the conservation pole – “security–personal”, “security–societal”, “conformity–rules”, “conformity–interpersonal”, “tradition” and “humility” (the last type partially belonging to the self-transcendence pole) – correlated positively and at the required level of statistical significance with vertical and horizontal collectivism. It is in accordance with premises verbalised in hypothesis 4. Correlations between “conformity–rules”, “conformity–interpersonal”, and “humility” value types and vertical individualism give negative marks. The dependencies were not contained in the hypothesis, however, they confirm the solid structure of the model: the higher the vertical individualism is, the lower is the preference of indicated value types associated with the conservation pole (the one related to collectivism). A significant positive indicator of correlation was noted between the “security–societal” value type and horizontal individualism, which is not in compliance with the hypothesis.

5. The value types associated with self-transcendence pole, “benevolence–dependability” and “benevolence–caring” correlated positively – as assumed in hypothesis 5 – with horizontal collectivism. These also correlated with vertical collectivism. Such dependency was not included in the hypothesis.

6. Value types included in the self-transcendence pole – “universalism–nature”, “universalism–societal concern” and “universalism–tolerance” – correlated positively and statistically significantly with horizontal individualism. It is in compliance with hypothesis 6. These types of values correlated positively with vertical individualism. A significant positive correlation indicator was noted between the “universalism–societal concern” value type and vertical collectivism, while negative correlation indicators – between “universalism–nature” and “universalism–tolerance” value types and horizontal collectivism. These dependencies are not in compliance with hypothesis 6.

Conclusions and summary

H.C. Triandis performed an analysis of mentality combining the “individualism – collectivism” with the dimension of power distance (“equality – hierarchy”). The crossing of these two dimensions allows to distinguish four types of mentality (horizontal individualism, vertical individualism, horizontal collectivism, vertical collectivism), which – according to the author – are tied to preferences regarding particular values. Mentality is a more general term, and can be reduced to basic elements: values are one of them (cf. theoretical part of the article). From a theoretical viewpoint, the dimension of the value of “openness to change – conservation”, should provide axiological basis for the “individualism – collectivism” mentality dimension (both horizontal and vertical). The “self-transcendence – self-enhancement” value dimension should provide axiological basis for the “individualism – collectivism” mentality, when they assume a horizontal or a vertical form.

The described study attempted to evaluate what dimensions and their subject value types are associated with individualism and collectivism in a horizontal and vertical orientation. In other words, whether each of the distinguished mentalities is specific axiologically.

In the light of the given results, one must notice, that the hypotheses were confirmed partially. Analysing the different mentalities in the „individualism – collectivism” dimension, one may actually conclude regarding the varying values in the „openness to change – conservation” dimension. The higher the individualism (both horizontal and vertical), the higher the preference of value types associated with the openness to change pole, i.e. “self-direction–thought”, “self-direction–action”, “stimulation” and “hedonism” (in the case of the last value type, a statistically significant correlation was noted only with horizontal individualism). The values indicate the need for independence, the urge to autonomously direct own life (in-

teresting, exciting and happy), striving for satisfying own needs and self-perfection. The higher the collectivism (both horizontal and vertical), the higher the preference of value types associated with the conservation pole, i.e. “security–personal”, “security–societal”, “tradition”, “conformity–rules”, “conformity–interpersonal” and “humility”. These values determine the behaviour of collectivists. They strive for the well-being of the group (e.g. family, ethnic, religious), security, interpersonal relations; they are prone to conformism and pro-societal attitude (within own group). The acquired results are in compliance with theoretical premises established by H.C. Triandis (1995) and confirm the studies by S. Oishi et al. (1998) and C.S. Cukur et al. (2004). The dependencies were described on the basis of samples associated with different cultures (i.a. Polish sample). Therefore, one should assume that the aforementioned value types constitute a significant element of the description of individualistic or collectivistic mentality.

The conclusions are not that obvious when we examine “individualism – collectivism” in the horizontal (emphasising on equality) and vertical (emphasising on hierarchy) orientations. It was supposed to be compatible with the dimension of the “self-enhancement – self-transcendence”. According to the hypotheses, it turned out that vertical individualism was related to the “achievement” value type (self-enhancement pole), and vertical collectivism – with “power–dominance”, “power–resources” and “face” value types (self-enhancement pole); horizontal individualism – with “universalism–nature”, “universalism–societal concern” and “universalism–tolerance” value types (self-transcendence pole), while horizontal collectivism – with “benevolence–dependability” and “benevolence–caring” value types (self-transcendence pole). However, positive correlation indicators appeared, which were not predicted from the theoretical point of view. The indicators challenge the reason for the premise, that acceptance of different values is inscribed in horizontal and vertical individualism. The same conclusion can be formulated regarding horizontal and vertical collectivism. Individualists (not only vertical, as had been assumed), would position the “achievement” value type higher, while collectivists (not only vertical, as had been assumed) would position “power” (over people and resources) and “face” types of value higher; the individualists (not only horizontal, as had been assumed) would position “universalism” (ecological, social, and tolerance) value type higher, while the collectivists (not only horizontal, as had been assumed), would position “benevolence” (reliability and care) value type higher. Moreover, some types of values – e.g. “achievement” were valued not only by vertical and (alternatively) horizontal individualists, but also by horizontal collectivists. The fact brings wonder, as this value is considered to be an indicator of individualistic mentality, and it is mostly used to explain the economic growth

of western countries. According to the interpretation made by D.C. McClelland (Bańka, 2016), the phase of higher economic growth is preceded by the higher level of motivation towards achievement.

What conclusions come from the configuration of “individualism – collectivism” with power distance, made by H.C. Triandis (1995)? The received results do not undermine the premise, that both individualists and collectivists may ascribe different meaning to equality and hierarchy. However, they indicate, that there have not appeared types of values (at least with the described study instruments), that would differentiate horizontal and vertical individualism, as well as, horizontal and vertical collectivism. It is possible, that if the study was focused on an isolated (and key from the viewpoint of the analysed issue) value of “equality” (and not on the types described by Schwartz, including a number of values), its relation with individualism and collectivism in horizontal and vertical orientation would appear. As noted by S. Feldman (2008), grouping numerous values into motivational domains (types) may distort the meaning of single values in explaining complex psychological and social issues.

Analyses based on single values were also performed by H.C. Triandis (2001, 2003; Triandis, Gelfand, 1998). He indicated the significance of “freedom” and “equality”. Triandis assumed that their relative positions correspond with the “individualism – collectivism” construct considered in the horizontal and vertical form. Horizontal individualism is related to situating “freedom” and “equality” highly, vertical individualism – to situating “freedom” high, and “equality” low. Horizontal collectivism is related to the high position of the “equality” value, and the low position of “freedom”, while vertical collectivism with low positions of both “equality” and “freedom”. In the analysis, H.C. Triandis included the Rokeach value theory, and his constructed study instrument, where single values are subject to ranking. Among them, one may find “freedom” and “equality”, key values from the viewpoint of the “individualism – collectivism” aspect (“independence – dependence” on others), and the power distance dimension (“equality – hierarchy”).

The aforementioned study shall be supplemented with additional information. It is possible due to the fact, that apart from using the Schwartz’s Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ-R3) – Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) was used. In the light of the analyses performed by H.C. Triandis, one may expect that the “freedom” value, will positively correlate with horizontal and vertical individualism (with the lack of relation or negative correlation indicators with horizontal and vertical collectivism); the “equality” value – with horizontal individualism and horizontal collectivism (with the lack of relation or negative correlation indicators with vertical individualism and vertical collectivism). It turned out that “equality” correlated

positively only with horizontal individualism ($p = 0,011$). However, "equality" correlated negatively only with vertical individualism ($p = 0,001$). Therefore, horizontal individualists (not focused on hierarchy) would value "freedom" higher, while vertical individualists (focused on hierarchy) – would value "equality" lower. Other relations appeared while studying collectivism. Neither its vertical or horizontal form was not tied to the "freedom" value. However, they were positively correlated with the "equality" value. Let us remind, that from the theoretical viewpoint such correlation should be expected solely of horizontal collectivism. Additionally, operating using single values one cannot confirm all premises assumed by Triandis.

To summarize, using the construct of value, the characteristics of individualistic and collectivistic mentalities is being established "precisely". The diversity of mentality perceived as such, probably plays the largest role in understanding values, due to the fact, that it determines the way in which individuals refer to groups. The results constitute a "problem", when one aims at identifying the pool of values specific for individualism and collectivism in their horizontal and vertical orientations. The "problem" occurs both when types of values are analysed, as well as, when the subject of analysis is the value that is the greatest expression of the difference, i.e. "equality".

One should note, that such analysis is important in regard to structural changes. According to H.C. Triandis (Kalmus, 2001), the transfer from socialism to a free market economy is possible with the change of societies' mentality from collectivist to individualist. However, he does not resolve the issue regarding what orientation of individualism it is supposed to be: vertical, which stimulates competitive capitalism and primitive accumulation of capital, or a horizontal one, which just spread across democratic societies? Individualism – it is "freedom" but not necessarily "equality". If "equality", then in what area: political or economic? When can we hope the domination in interpersonal relations to be put to an end, with the establishment of peaceful relations and allowing expansion and self-development?

Bibliography

- Bańka A. (2016), *Motywacja osiągnięć. Podstawy teoretyczne i konstrukcja skali do pomiaru motywacji osiągnięć w wymiarze międzynarodowym*, Warszawa.
- Bond M.H., Smith P.B. (1996), *Cross-cultural, social and organizational psychology*, „Annual Review of Psychology”, vol. 47.
- Boski P. (2009), *Kulturowe ramy zachowań społecznych. Podręcznik psychologii międzykulturowej*, Warszawa.

- Chen C.C., Meindl J.R., Hunt R.G. (1997), *Testing the effects of vertical and horizontal collectivism: A study of reward allocation preferences in China*, „Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology”, vol. 28.
- Cieciuch J. (2013), *Pomiar wartości w zmodyfikowanym modelu Shaloma Schwartza*, „Psychologia Społeczna”, vol. 8.
- Cukur C.S., de Guzman M.R.T., Carlo G. (2004), *Religiosity, Values, and Horizontal and Vertical Individualism – Collectivism: A Study of Turkey, the United States, and the Philippines*, „The Journal of Social Psychology”, vol. 144.
- Czerniawska M. (2010), *Zmiany wartości i postaw młodzieży w okresie przeobrażeń ustrojowych. Kolektywizm versus indywidualizm. Studium interdyscyplinarne*, Białystok.
- Czerniawska M. (2018), *Postawy wobec religii, instytucji religijnych i religijnie motywowanej etyki – aksjologiczne uwarunkowania różnic*, „Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja”, vol. 21.
- Feldman S. (2008), *Wartości, ideologia i strukturalizacja postaw politycznych*, in: *Psychologia polityczna*, eds. D.O. Sears, L. Huddy, R. Jervis, trans. R. Andruszko, Kraków.
- Hofstede G. (1980), *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*, Beverly Hills.
- Hofstede G. (1991), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, London.
- Hofstede G. (2000), *Kultury i organizacje: zaprogramowanie umysłu*, Warszawa.
- Hofstede G. (2001), *Culture's consequences. Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*, Thousand Oaks.
- Kalmus V. (2001), *Socialization to values: Collectivism and individualism in the abc-books of the 20th century Estonia*, „Trames”, vol. 5 (55/50).
- Kashima Y. (2000), *Conceptions of culture and person for psychology*, „Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology”, vol. 31.
- Kim U., Park Y.S. (2006), *The scientific foundation of indigenous and cultural psychology: The transactional approach*, in: *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context*, eds. U. Kim, K.-S. Yang, K.-K. Hwang, New York.
- Matsumoto D., Yoo S.H. (2006), *Toward a New Generation of Cross-Cultural Research*, „Perspectives on Psychological Science”, vol. 1.
- Oishi S., Schimmack U., Diener E., Suh E.M. (1998), *The measurement of values and individualism-collectivism*, „Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin”, vol. 24.
- Schwartz S.H. (1992), *Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries*, „Advances in Experimental Social Psychology”, vol. 25.
- Schwartz S.H. (1994), *Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values: Theoretical and methodological approaches to study of collectivism and individualism*, in: *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and application*, eds. U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, G. Yoon, London.
- Schwartz S.H. (1996a), *Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems*, in: *The psychology of values: The Ontario Symposium*, vol. 8, eds. C. Seligman, J.M. Olson, M.P. Zanna Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Schwartz S.H. (1996b), *Wartości*, in: *Encyklopedia Blackwella. Psychologia społeczna*, eds. A.S.R. Manstead, M. Hewstone, Warszawa.
- Schwartz S.H., Cieciuch J., Vecchione M., Torres C., Dirilen-Gumus O., Butenko T. (2017), *Value tradeoffs propel and inhibit behavior: Validating the 19 refined values in four countries*, „European Journal of Social Psychology”, vol. 47.
- Singelis T.M., Triandis H.C., Bhawuk D.S., Gelfand M. (1995), *Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement*, „Cross-Cultural Research”, vol. 29.

- Steenkamp J.-B.E.M. (2001), *The role of national culture in international marketing research*. „International Marketing Review”, vol. 18.
- Triandis H.C. (1990), *Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism*, in: *Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1989*, ed. J. Berman, Lincoln.
- Triandis H.C. (1994), *Culture and social behavior*, New York.
- Triandis H.C. (1995), *Individualism and collectivism*, Boulder.
- Triandis H.C. (1996a), *Kultura subiektywna*, in: *Encyklopedia Blackwella. Psychologia społeczna*, eds. A.S.R. Manstead, M. Hewstone, trans. A. Bieniek et al., Warszawa.
- Triandis H.C. (1996b), *The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes*, „American Psychologist”, vol. 51.
- Triandis H.C. (2001), *Individualism-collectivism and personality*, „Journal of Personality”, vol. 69.
- Triandis H.C. (2003), *Индивидуализм и коллективизм: прошлое, настоящее и будущее*, in: *Психология и культура*, ed. D. Matsumoto, trans. A.C. Кармин, СПб.
- Triandis H.C., Chen X.P., Chan D.K. (1998), *Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism*, „Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology”, vol. 29.
- Triandis H.C., Gelfand M.J. (1998), *Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism*, „Journal of Personality and Social Psychology”, vol. 74.
- Triandis H.C., McCusker C., Hui C.H. (1990), *Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism*, „Journal of Personality and Social Psychology”, vol. 59.

