

The horizontal and vertical distinction within individualism and collectivism was used as a theoretical framework to predict differences in achievement values across two national cultures: Denmark and the United States. As expected, across multiple methods and informant groups, the United States was found to be more vertically oriented than Denmark and Denmark more horizontally oriented than the United States. These differences in cultural orientations also corresponded to differences in the importance placed on achievement and the display of success. In open-ended responses and quantitative ratings, U.S. individuals discussed the importance of achieving goals more frequently and evaluated achievement values more highly than Danes did. Implications for understanding the cultural antecedents of achievement values are discussed.

## **HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL INDIVIDUALISM AND ACHIEVEMENT VALUES**

### **A Multimethod Examination of Denmark and the United States**

MICHELLE R. NELSON  
*University of Wisconsin–Madison*

SHARON SHAVITT  
*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

*Probably the best beer in town.*

—Carlsberg Beer advertising slogan

Best-selling Beer in America.

—U.S. beer slogan

Advertisements often reflect cultural values (Pollay, 1987). In this case, the Danish brewer espouses its modesty and the U.S. beer maker its competitive prowess. These slogans mark cultural beliefs related to achievement and norms describing the appropriate display of success. This article explores the relationship between achievement values and the horizontal/vertical elements of individualism and collectivism by examining cultural differences across two Western individualistic cultures that are presumed to vary along the horizontal and vertical axis: Denmark and the United States.

*Achievement* has been defined as “personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards” (Schwartz, 1992). Its importance is based, in part, on the positive relationship between the value (achievement) and other personal and cultural indicators such as self-esteem (Feather, 1998; Wigfield & Eccles, 1994) and economic development (McClelland, 1961), respectively. The tension between the pursuit of individual achievement and the oppositional concern for others has been described as a universal values conflict (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990, p. 887) and an important aspect of social analysis (Feather, Volkmer, & McKee, 1992, p. 104). Past research on achievement values has repeatedly shown cultural (e.g., Feather, 1998; McClelland, 1961, 1963; Niles, 1998) and gender (Feather, 1998; Horner, 1972; Monahan, Kuhn, & Shaver, 1974) differences in the importance placed on this value. To understand how achievement is viewed within and across cultures, however, it is important to examine cultural constructs.

The individualism/collectivism (I/C) construct describes a cultural syndrome in which individualists tend to give priority to individual goals and collectivists place more emphasis on group goals and norms (Triandis, 1995a, 1995b). This broad and influential construct may be useful for predicting and understanding differences in achievement values. For example, the theory of achievement motivation asserted that collectivists are constrained in their motivation to achieve and that achievement behavior is individualistic, hailing from Western child-rearing practices (e.g., McClelland, 1961). In a study of Turkish (parent-child dyad) immigrants in Germany, parental collectivism discouraged achievement goals for children (Phalet & Schonpflug, 2001). However, other research has argued that collectivists are motivated by social-oriented, not individual-oriented, achievement goals (e.g., Niles, 1998; Triandis, 1995b; Yu & Yang, 1994). Such differences in motivations and meanings of achievement across cultures complicate the comparison to individualistic cultures (e.g., Fyans, Maehr, Salili, & Desai, 1983; Phalet & Lens, 1995).

Across individualistic cultures, studies generally find that U.S. individuals are more achievement-oriented when compared to others. For example, Americans rated achievement values highest among three individualist countries: Australia, the United States, and Canada (Feather, 1998). In contrast, Australians are found to value achievement at the individual level but also wish to cut down "tall poppies" (Feather, 1994). This apparent ambivalence toward high achievers is attributed to the Australian belief that "success should not lead to inequalities and differences in status" (Feather, 1994, p. 183). Scandinavian cultures have shown similar attitudes toward achievement. In Norway, parents expect their children to achieve, yet their peers distrust such success (Rodnick, 1955). Swedes do not like to be conspicuous (Daun, 1991, 1992), and only 2% of Swedes surveyed aspired to high social status as compared with 7% of Americans (Triandis, 1995a, p. 45). Danes, who share a similar language and culture with Swedes and Norwegians (Tagil, 1995), also look down on conspicuous success and braggarts (Askaard, 1992).

These differences in attitudes toward achievement and aspiration for success may be related to common cultural factors, for example, the horizontal and vertical (H/V) dimensions of individualism and collectivism (Singelis & Triandis, 1995; Triandis, 1995a, 1995b; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). The H/V distinction tracks important differences in the way that individuals view the self and contributes to understanding a culture's value system (see Maheswaran & Shavitt, 2000). Individuals in horizontal societies value equality and view the self as having the same status as others in society. Individuals in vertical societies view the self as differing from others along a hierarchy—they accept inequality and believe that rank has its privileges (Triandis, 1995a). These dimensions can be combined with I/C to produce four cultural orientations: HI (independent, same status), VI (independent, different status), HC (interdependent, same status), and VC (interdependent, different status) (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995).

Whereas the United States, Australia, and Scandinavia are all considered to be individualistic (Hofstede, 1980), they appear to differ along horizontal and vertical cultural dimensions. As described above, Australia and Scandinavia show aversion to conspicuously successful persons (likely indicative of horizontal orientations; Feather, 1994) whereas people in the United States (likely a VI society) have been shown to aspire to such distinction and financial success (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Weldon, 1984). In fact, in the United States, "Success is communicated, shared and displayed because it is natural to show off" (de Mooij, 1998, p. 195). These cultural differences likely hold ramifications for individuals' values—including achievement-related values (Triandis, 1995b). Indeed, research has shown positive relationships among U.S. respondents between VI and achievement and power values

and negative relationships between those values and HC (Oishi, Schimmack, Diener, & Suh, 1998).

This article compares achievement and related values in a VI society (the United States) and an HI society (Denmark) using qualitative and quantitative methods. Cross-cultural researchers have increasingly noted the importance of using multiple methods—including incorporating qualitative and quantitative approaches (e.g., Amir & Sharon, 1987; Campbell, 1986; Hui & Triandis, 1985; Miller, 2001; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990) and measuring cultural orientations directly (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2000). Accordingly, in-depth interviews and structured scales were used to assess cultural orientations and compare the nature of achievement values in Denmark and the United States. We expected that differences in H/V orientations would be related to the importance placed on achievement values, with a greater importance placed on such values in a VI society (the United States).

### **PREDICTING HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL ORIENTATIONS IN DENMARK AND THE UNITED STATES**

Denmark and the United States are Western individualistic cultures (Hofstede, 1980). However, Denmark, as part of Scandinavian culture, is presumed to be horizontally oriented (Triandis, 1995a) due, in part, to its social welfare economy. A personal income tax structure that taxes to 69%, with welfare support, ensures that most Danes belong to the middle class. Indeed, only 4% of families in Denmark live below the poverty line (“Social Challenges,” 1997). The first social welfare law was passed in 1933, and since then it has been renewed and refined with legislation built on the principles of “social solidarity with the least fortunate groups in society via comprehensive social welfare legislation based on the principle of care” (Himmelstrup, 1992, p. 1). This law relates to the popular democratic teachings of 19th century philosopher N. F. S. Grundtvig, whose words in “Much Higher the Mountains Are” are still sung in classrooms: “And then in wealth we’ve come far when few have too much and less have too little.”

In addition, Denmark and Norway share a ubiquitous, unwritten social modesty code, *Janteloven* (Jante Law), which profoundly influences attitudes and behaviors. *Janteloven*, which derives from a 1933 novel by Aksel Sandemose, features an imaginary Danish town called Jante in which the law dictates social and moral standards. The Jante Law consists of 10 commandments meaning, “Thou Shalt Not Believe Thou Art Something” (Strange, 1996). Although some suggest the code was developed from a “political desire for equality for everyone,” others believe it operates on envy and inadequacy (Isherwood, 1992, p. 198). Thus, benevolent policies toward the least fortunate in society, coupled with a social modesty code that frowns on showing off, characterize Danish society.

In contrast, the United States is likely to be vertically oriented (Triandis, 1995a). Historically, the frontier spirit and financial incentives to explore new territories attracted and reinforced values of individual achievement and success (Spence, 1985). Religious pressure also enforced a Protestant work ethic (Tawney, 1926). The American notion of equality is “equal opportunity,” reflected in the tax system and resource allocation. In a study of 26 industrialized nations, the United States ranked first in the number of millionaires and billionaires and ranked second only to Russia in income disparity (Wallechinsky, 1997). In addition, in 1999, an estimated 13% of U.S. citizens were living below the poverty line (*World Factbook*, 2000). This suggests a hierarchical ranking of income notable among vertical societies. Literature and popular culture in the United States promote the notion of

social mobility up the vertical ladder through rags-to-riches themes and depictions of the American Dream.

No research to date has compared Denmark and the United States on horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism. However, based on the differences described above, it is likely that the United States is more vertical and less horizontal in cultural orientation than Denmark.

## CULTURAL VALUES

Cultural orientations are antecedents and consequences of individuals' value priorities. Values are defined as "desirable goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people's lives" (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995, p. 93). In our research, values are measured via informants' responses to open-ended questions designed to elicit values and priorities and individuals' ratings of values on Schwartz's survey of terminal (end states; e.g., freedom) and instrumental goals (modes of behavior; e.g., obedient). Schwartz's survey has been validated across 88 samples from 40 different countries (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995) including Denmark (e.g., Schwartz, 1992; Grunert & Juhl, 1995) and the United States (e.g., Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990). Two of the value domains within this survey are most appropriate for our study: Self-Enhancement and Self-Transcendence, which reflect "a conflict between acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare versus pursuit of one's own relative success and dominance over others" (Schwartz, 1996, p. 5). Self-Enhancement is made up of values relating to achievement and power. Self-Transcendence is made up of values related to benevolence ("preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact") and universalism ("understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature," Schwartz, 1994, p. 22). The importance attributed to these value domains and values are examined here as well as their relations to the horizontal and vertical dimensions of I/C. We expect the United States, and vertical cultural orientations in general, to be associated with endorsement of achievement and Self-Enhancement values. We expect Denmark, and horizontal cultural orientations in general, to be associated with endorsement of Self-Transcendence values.

## STUDY 1: IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

### METHOD

#### Participants and Design

The first study was conducted to obtain a rich understanding of Danish and U.S. cultures and values using methods from the interpretive paradigm. Semistructured interviews were used to examine the cultural orientations of Danes versus Americans and to investigate their values. In-depth interviews were conducted via stages (McCracken, 1988). Danish informants (7 men and 8 women) were recruited via a snowball method from southern Jutland and Copenhagen and ranged in age from 22 to 59 years. Four key informants who did not know one another and were of different ages, occupations, and geographic locations were first recruited; they then each recommended 1 person, and so forth. Nine informants were

students and the other 6 were employed full-time in professional positions. All had received or were in the process of receiving their bachelor's or master's degree from a Danish university. In the United States, 5 key informants led to the selection of 12 informants (6 men and 6 women) from a Midwestern college town within the same age group and educational strata as the Danes.

All interviews were conducted in English, which did not seem to pose a problem in Denmark as most Danes speak English fluently. Informants responded to the following, in order: (a) demographic questions, (b) Cultural Orientation Scenarios (Triandis, Chen, & Chan, 1998), (c) open-ended questions designed to elicit underlying values and goals (e.g., "What makes you happy?" and "What do you hope to be doing 10 years from now?"), and (d) questions about social codes (Jante Law or the American Dream). Triandis et al.'s (1998) measure assessed horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism using 16 scenario-type items (e.g., "Suppose you had one word to describe yourself"). Each of the four choices provided for the scenarios corresponded to a different cultural orientation (e.g., an HC response to the above question would be "cooperative" and a VI response would be "competitive"). In line with Triandis et al.'s scoring method, an individual's overall profile was assessed by the proportion of times his or her chosen response reflected a given cultural orientation (HI, HC, VI, or VC).

Interviews ranged from 25 to 120 minutes. Most interviews were taped and notes were taken for nonverbal cues and other contextual information. Compensation for participation in Denmark included coffee or red wine because key informants had advised not to offer monetary rewards. In the United States, participants were offered a cup of coffee or a small monetary reward (\$3).

### **Interpretation and Results**

More than 300 pages of text were generated from interview sessions. Responses were coded according to principles of the constant comparative method outlined by Glaser and Strauss (1967) for qualitative research. With this method, the researcher reads through the transcripts several times, moving from the specific to the general, and devises categories. The researcher then "builds and clarifies categories by going back through the evidence more than once" (p. 224) while grouping responses and checking goodness of fit. Interpretation was conducted according to common practices in qualitative or ethnographic research, where the interpreter becomes part of the process—not as an impartial objective researcher but as someone who is fully aware of research questions. In this domain, the researcher notes his or her assumptions and uses questions and observations as a way of informing the interpretation (Lindlof, 1995). To gain validity, however, member checks were conducted by asking key Danish informants to examine interpretations (McCracken, 1988). The number of times individuals within each culture mentioned a certain concept was also tallied quantitatively so that responses could be compared across cultures.

### **Cultural Orientation**

Responses to the scenarios showed that, as expected, U.S. participants' cultural orientations were less horizontal and more vertical than those of Danish participants (see Table 1). However, Danish and U.S. participants' cultural orientations were more horizontal than they were vertical. To test the significance of the differences in proportions, the Fisher-Irwin (F-I) nonparametric test was conducted (Marascuilo & Serlin, 1988). It should be noted that the F-

**TABLE 1**  
**Study 1: Average Proportion Score on the Scenario Measure  
of Cultural Orientation in Denmark and the United States**

<i>Cultural Orientation</i>	<i>Denmark (n = 15)</i>	<i>United States (n = 12)</i>	<i>z</i>
Horizontal individualism	49	44	1.09
Horizontal collectivism	35	28	1.43
Horizontal orientation	42	36	1.76*
Vertical individualism	8	20	-3.76*
Vertical collectivism	8	6	0.51
Vertical orientation	7	15	-3.45*

NOTE: The proportions presented are an average score for national culture on each particular orientation. They were calculated from the proportion of times individuals within each culture selected the response corresponding to each cultural orientation out of 16 scenarios. Differences between proportions were calculated using the Fisher-Irwin nonparametric test.

\*For this cultural dimension, differences between proportions differed at  $p < .05$  ( $z > 1.65$  critical value).

I test assumes independent observations, although responses to this scale that reflect different cultural orientations are not independent. This should be kept in mind when interpreting the results. Danes' responses revealed horizontal (either collectivist or individualist) orientations to a significantly greater extent than did Americans',  $z = 1.76$ ,  $p < .05$ . No significant differences were found between cultures in HC or HI responses specifically. Conversely, Americans' responses revealed vertical orientations to a greater extent than did Danes',  $z = -3.45$ ,  $p < .05$ . A closer examination suggests that VI responses are driving these overall differences. Americans selected VI to a much greater extent than did Danes,  $z = -3.76$ ,  $p < .05$ .

### **Emerging Themes: Cultural Values**

*What makes you happy?* To gain a richer understanding of values in these societies, open-ended questions were posed next, such as the grand tour question, "What makes you happy?" A number of themes emerged from Danish informants (see Table 2). The most commonly mentioned theme refers to time spent with friends or family. Interestingly, this response, which coincides with the HC cultural orientation due to its emphasis on relationships, corresponds to the high HC scores presented in Table 1. The second most common theme concerned the Danes' relationship to nature, which may be reflective of universalism values (Schwartz, 1992). Often these two types of activities would occur together. Indeed, 13 of the 15 Danish informants specifically mentioned being with friends or family and 12 mentioned enjoying the outdoors.

Americans' responses to "What makes you happy?" also reflected a number of themes. Like the Danes, their most common theme referred to their friends or families. This is not surprising, given the high HC score for Americans in Table 1. Nine of the 12 informants mentioned that other people made them happy. However, a recurrent theme found solely in Americans' responses focused on the happiness gained from having and/or achieving one's goals. These achievement values are related to VI. It is noteworthy that Americans' responses to this open-ended query closely match those given for the VI measure (see Table 1). Seven of the 12 Americans mentioned achievement or goals in relation to happiness. None of the Danes did. The hierarchical nature of the United States promotes and rewards those who set goals and attain them, whereas the same values would be looked down on in an

**TABLE 2**  
**Study 1: Themes Emerging From Open-Ended Value Questions**

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>% of Total</i>	<i>% of Individuals</i>
<b>What makes you happy?</b>			
Denmark ( <i>n</i> = 15) <sup>a</sup>			
Friends/family	13	34	87
Being in nature	12	32	80
Reading	3	8	20
Cooking	3	8	20
United States ( <i>n</i> = 12) <sup>b</sup>			
Friends/lovers	9	28	75
Goals/achievement	7	22	58
Hiking/outdoors	3	9	25
Reading	3	9	25
Music	3	9	25
Sports	2	6	17
<b>Where do you see yourself in the future?</b>			
Denmark ( <i>n</i> = 15) <sup>c</sup>			
Family/children	13	36	86
Mid-range position	6	17	40
Interesting job/job that makes you happy	4	11	26
Relaxing life—not too stressed	4	11	26
House in the country	2	6	13
Living in a “little” house	2	6	6
United States ( <i>n</i> = 12) <sup>d</sup>			
Good job/career	9	35	75
Married	4	15	33
Family/children	4	15	33
Own business/freedom	3	12	25
Living in a city	2	8	17
Good friends	2	8	17

a. Healthy, dancing, own apartment, a partner, sports, cinema, and my dog were each mentioned once. Total number of unique themes = 13, total number of responses = 38.

b. Dancing, loving family, my dog, cooking, and sex were each mentioned once. Total number of unique themes = 11, total number of responses = 32.

c. Living in suburbs, nice garden, being in a band, healthy, and friends were each mentioned once. Total number of unique themes = 11, total number of responses = 36.

d. Rich and retired as well as owning house were each mentioned once. Total number of unique themes = 8, total number of responses = 26.

HI society that criticizes those who rise above others. As a Danish attorney explained, “There’s no incentive to achieve more or work harder here. My taxes are so high that it’s actually cheaper for me to take the afternoon off work and go golfing.”

*Assessing the future.* To assess their future goals and enduring motivations, informants were asked, “Where do you see yourself?” or “Where would you like to be 10 years from now?” Danes often mentioned family and then work goals (see Table 2), but their responses reflected the Jante Law. They did not wish for status and money, a big house, and a lot of possessions, but a moderate amount. For all but 2 respondents, their first priority was family and second was work, which was true regardless of gender or age. These priorities reflect the emphasis on relationships (HC orientation) over money and power (VI orientation), consistent with responses to the cultural orientation measure (see Table 1). In addition, work-

related goals were defined in terms of personal satisfaction and freedom, not lofty financial aspirations. Not one of the Danes mentioned wealth as an end, but 6 mentioned a moderate amount of money associated with their jobs. This assessment was further validated by a Danish informant who said, "Very few Danes focus on their careers or making lots of money." The shared emphasis on work and family demonstrated in the Danes' responses is indicative of values related to self-transcendence (i.e., the importance placed on caring for others as opposed to an emphasis on one's own personal success).

When Americans were asked about the future, their responses reflected career options first, often with an interest in entrepreneurship and, for women, the desire for family, too. Similar to their Danish counterparts, 4 of the 6 women mentioned family and career. The single men, on the other hand, almost unanimously mentioned work-related goals alone. When probed about their personal lives, they tended to define marriage as an option but not necessarily a goal. These results are quite different from the single Danish males, who always mentioned family in their responses. In addition, the entrepreneurial spirit heard in Americans' responses was completely lacking from Danish informants. Perhaps this reflects the influence of the American Dream prevalent in the United States. Responses reflected elements of freedom, rewards, and influence without the themes of modesty and moderation prevalent in the Danes' responses.

*Gauging informants' responses to prevailing social codes.* Another way to gauge individuals' values is to examine their responses to prevailing social codes, such as Janteloven and the American Dream. These codes relate to individuals' values regarding achievement and the display of success. Whereas a rags-to-riches American Dream story emphasizes competitive behaviors to rise above others, the Janteloven rewards modesty and blending into the group. Questions about these codes were posed at the end of the interviews, however, so as not to bias responses to other questions.

Brigitte, a 30-year-old manager, mentioned how their social code hurt the entrepreneurial spirit in Denmark:

The Jante Law is still going on in terms of social status . . . it is making people be equal now. It will take many years to accept that some people are really good at money and earning a lot. We have examples of people's companies torn down because other people were envying them.

The positive benefits of the code (in making people more equal) were noted by 6 respondents but always with a caveat for its negative influence. They discussed the possibility of being successful without harming others. Kirsten suggested, "Personal expression is crucial but without bragging and with modesty." Therefore, it seems that achievement and success would be acceptable in Danish society if the person behaved in the socially appropriate manner. Lars, a 28-year-old architect, explained these behavioral adjustments:

It's like if you get rich, you say it happened by "coincidence, I couldn't help it." You downplay it a lot. If you are rich, you don't have to buy a nice car and say like, "Here I am, I'm so smart." If you do, people don't like it, you don't have friends. That is envy, they call you smart guys.

The Danish attorney said that the Danish 1996 Tour de France winner, Bjarne Riis, was admired "because he acted 'right.' He did not act like Muhammad Ali and say he was the best and all of that."

Americans' understanding of and attitudes toward their own social code—the American Dream—were also assessed. The common themes in U.S. informants' responses involved achievement, efforts to work hard and improve oneself, and the resultant rewards of property and material goods. All 12 informants listed material possessions in connection with the American Dream, and 8 out of 12 mentioned advancement, self-improvement, or achievement in their responses. For 4 participants, their individual versions of the American Dream placed less emphasis on material concerns and more emphasis on happiness. For example, Tim said,

I think it operates on a number of levels. Financially, it's about owning stuff, having a nice house and a nice salary. But personally, it is more about being happy day to day and finding the right person and being happy together. For me, it is not the financial part so much, but the second part. It is more about a day-to-day flowing of happiness.

Rick's (age 25) response demonstrated the American notion of equal opportunity (as opposed to equality), "The idea that you can advance no matter where you are . . . that there are equal opportunities and that we all have the unfettered ability to advance and live a life we want to lead if we work hard enough." These informants seemed hesitant to state that the material components of the social code fit with their own goals. Two others were less affected by any potential social desirability bias. Mike (a math student) said, "I'm easy, I have a shallow answer for you. I want to be successful, to have money, to have nice stuff, to be able to travel and not to worry about money." Similarly, 24-year-old Jeremy described his dream:

Number 1 is freedom—personal and political—the opportunity to make as much money as possible. That's acceptable in a way, isn't that what everyone wants? Oh, except I met this girl once at a party who hated Bill Gates because he was making millions of dollars and not giving it all away. I mean, can you believe that?

In sum, respondents generally understood the American Dream in terms of achievement values, career success, and material rewards. The only negative responses to this social code, noted by 50% of respondents, related to materialism as an end in itself.

## DISCUSSION

In-depth interviews combined with scenario-based structured scales (Triandis et al., 1998) provided a preliminary multimethod examination of cultural values. Results indicated that although Danes and Americans displayed a greater emphasis on horizontal cultural values than vertical ones and an emphasis on people as a way to gain happiness, the extent and expression of those values differed.

The biggest difference in cultural orientations was reflected for VI. The Danes were significantly less likely than Americans to select the scenario response resonating with VI values. The Danes were significantly more likely, however, to select horizontal responses than were the Americans. Although the H/V constructs may be situation-specific and individuals may reflect varying levels of each cultural orientation (Triandis, 1995a), the scenario instrument captured a range of situations. These differences reflect sociocultural and economic variables related to each national culture. Danish culture does not adhere to the VI notions of privilege, rank, and conspicuous success, instead emphasizing an equality that is reinforced through prevailing social codes and social and economic institutions. American culture, on

the other hand, embraces VI by placing importance on “being the best” through setting goals and working hard to achieve them. Indeed, Americans’ responses toward open-ended questions emphasized goals and achievement, and they embraced such elements of the American Dream. Conversely, although Danes expressed ambivalence about the Jante Law, their own responses tended to reflect elements of this modesty code when they discussed their future goals.

## STUDY 2: QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

### METHOD

#### Participants and Procedure

In an effort to achieve triangulation (Denzin, 1978), the second study used additional sets of informants and another methodology. The focus of Study 2 was on measuring relationships between variables (national culture, cultural orientation, and values), and thus quantitative methods (structured questionnaires) were deemed most appropriate. Danish respondents were 82 communication students (47 men, 35 women) from a university near Copenhagen and were aged 21 to 35 years (median age = 24). U.S. sample respondents were 152 communication students (55 men, 97 women) from a large, Midwestern university. Ages ranged from 19 to 23 years (median age = 20). Respondents were given questionnaires in a classroom setting to complete at their own pace. Questionnaires were translated and back-translated (Miracle, 1988) into Danish by two bilingual volunteers.

#### Dependent Measures

*I/C scale.* This I/C scale (Singelis & Triandis, 1995; Triandis, 1995a) consists of 32 items with 8 items designed to evaluate each of the four cultural orientations (i.e., HC, HI, VI, and VC). On each of the 32 items plus an additional 2 items, respondents indicated their level of agreement on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*disagree*) to 7 (*agree*) (e.g., VI item: “Winning is everything”; HI item: “One should live one’s life independently of others”). Mean scores on each of the four orientations were computed as described below.

*Value survey.* The Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990; Schwartz, 1992) assesses 10 value types (power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security) with measures of terminal and instrumental values that represent each type. Opposing value types are then organized into bipolar value dimensions. Subjects rated the importance of all 57 values “as a guiding principle in my life” on a 9-point scale ranging from –1 (*opposed to my values*) to 7 (*of supreme importance*). Before rating all of the values, informants selected and rated their most and least important values to anchor their use of the response scale. Two of the opposing value dimensions were of particular relevance to this research, and thus our analyses focused on them: Self-Enhancement and Self-Transcendence represent the opposition between accepting others as equals and concern for their welfare (universalism and benevolence value types) and pursuit of individual success and dominance over others (power and achievement value types).

## RESULTS

### Preliminary Analyses

To eliminate the effects of possible response styles within and across cultures, raw scores on the I/C scale and the Schwartz Value Survey were standardized within subjects before analysis (Bond, 1988; Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Given that there is some uncertainty about the merits and type of standardization to be performed (Leung & Bond, 1989; Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997), analyses were also run on nonstandardized means.

Due to the small size of the Danish sample, a confirmatory factor analysis could not be conducted. However, the following procedures were employed to examine the comparability of factor structures in an attempt to demonstrate measurement equivalence, although it is noted that this procedure cannot guarantee full-score equivalence (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). For the I/C scale, standardized scores for each set of 8 items designated a priori as reflecting a given cultural orientation were submitted to a principal components factor analysis (with oblique rotation) within each culture. This intracultural analysis was recommended by Triandis (1995a) to identify common (etic) factors to be used in subsequent cultural comparisons.

Four separate analyses were conducted for each culture—one for each cultural orientation subscale (HI, HC, VI, and VC). Those items loading more than .30 and common to both cultures were then averaged to calculate each of the cultural orientation indices (see Table 3). For the HI orientation, 3 items (6, 15, and 21) were retained. HC used 5 items, 3 original scale items (14, 20, and 28) plus 2 items that were added to this factor and loaded well with the other items. These items were added to the scale to reflect workplace patterns and social issues (healthcare) relevant to the national cultures of interest. VI retained 8 items (4, 8, 10, 12, 19, 23, 26, and 30). VC retained 4 items (3, 7, 13, and 24). The smaller number of items retained for HI and VC suggested that comparison of item content and theoretical constructs be conducted. Consistent with what Kurman and Sriram (2002) found in their use of the scale in Israel and Singapore, the items retained for the HI subscale reflected an emphasis on uniqueness and the items for VC reflected self-sacrifice for the group. The VC items appeared generally consistent with the intended construct; however, the HI items only partially captured the meaning of the construct. Items related to independence (e.g., “I often do ‘my own thing’”) and being direct/forthright were not retained. Interestingly, none of the HI items directly address the notion of being the same in status, as the definition suggests.

Internal reliabilities (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) for the cultural orientation indices were generally comparable across cultures, except in the case of HI where they were lower for the American sample (for the Danish sample: HI  $\alpha$  = .63, HC  $\alpha$  = .57, VI  $\alpha$  = .66, VC  $\alpha$  = .44; and for the American sample: HI  $\alpha$  = .46, HC  $\alpha$  = .53, VI  $\alpha$  = .68, and VC  $\alpha$  = .47). Correlational analyses for the four subscales revealed as expected that VI was negatively correlated with HC ( $r$  =  $-.55$ ,  $p$  < .0001) and VC ( $r$  =  $-.29$ ,  $p$  < .0001), and that HI was negatively correlated with VC ( $r$  =  $-.19$ ,  $p$  < .01). However, correlations between horizontal and vertical aspects of either individualism or collectivism were more modest: VI and HI were correlated at  $r$  =  $-.14$ ,  $p$  = .053, whereas VC and HC were uncorrelated,  $r$  = .01,  $ns$ . This suggests that the vertical and horizontal subscales can be viewed as largely, although not completely, independent.

Because the Schwartz Value Survey has been validated with Danish and U.S. populations (e.g., Grunert & Juhl, 1995; Schwartz, 1992) and the theorized structure of value relations has replicated well in both cultures (Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995), means for values, value types, and value dimensions were computed according to the items' a priori

**TABLE 3**  
**Study 2: Items Used in Individualism/Collectivism Scale**

---



---

1. I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk with people (HI).
2. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me (HC).
3. I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity (VC). <sup>a</sup>
4. Winning is everything (VI). <sup>a</sup>
5. One should live one's life independently of others (HI).
6. What happens to me is my own doing (HI). <sup>a</sup>
7. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group (VC). <sup>a</sup>
8. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do (VI). <sup>a</sup>
9. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group (HC).
10. It is important to me that I do my job better than others (VI). <sup>a</sup>
11. I like sharing little things with my neighbors (HC).
12. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others (VI). <sup>a</sup>
13. We should keep our aging parents with us at home (VC). <sup>a</sup>
14. The well-being of my coworkers is important to me (HC). <sup>a</sup>
15. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways (HI). <sup>a</sup>
16. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means (HC). <sup>a</sup>
17. Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award (VC).
18. I often do "my own thing" (HI).
19. Competition is the law of nature (VI). <sup>a</sup>
20. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud (HC).
21. I am a unique individual (HI). <sup>a</sup>
22. To me, pleasure is spending time with others (HC).
23. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused (VI). <sup>a</sup>
24. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it (VC). <sup>a</sup>
25. I like my privacy (HI).
26. Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society (VI). <sup>a</sup>
27. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure (VC).
28. I feel good when I cooperate with others (HC). <sup>a</sup>
29. I hate to disagree with others in my group (VC).
30. Some people emphasize winning; I am not one of them (VI—reverse-scored). <sup>a</sup>
31. Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends (VC).
32. When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities (HI).
33. I think cooperation in the workplace is more important than competition (HC). <sup>a, b</sup>
34. I think it is important that everyone has equal access to healthcare (HC). <sup>a, b</sup>

---

NOTE: HI = independent, same status; HC = interdependent, same status; VC = interdependent, different status; and VI = independent, different status.

a. Item used in computing mean standardized scores and analyses.

b. Item was added to the original scale.

classifications. To ensure internal consistency, reliability tests were conducted for each of the value dimensions and values. All of the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  exceeded .71.

### **I/C Scale**

Although Denmark and the United States are presumed to be individualist cultures, it was expected that Danish participants would score higher on horizontal orientation indices and that U.S. participants would score higher on vertical orientation indices. However, the scores of Danes and Americans were more horizontal than vertical (see Table 4), consistent with the findings of Study 1. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with culture and gender as the independent variables and the four cultural orientation scales (HI, HC, VI, and VC) as dependent variables. Gender was included as a variable of interest, as

**TABLE 4**  
**Study 2: Standardized Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate Comparisons**  
**for Individualism/Collectivism Scales by National Culture and Gender**

	<i>Cultural Orientation Subscale</i>							
	<i>HI</i>		<i>HC</i>		<i>VI</i>		<i>VC</i>	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Denmark	.45	.54	.68	.47 <sub>a</sub>	-.41	.46	-.84	.46 <sub>b</sub>
Women	.49	.51	.78	.28	-.61	.36 <sub>c</sub>	-.79	.33
Men	.44	.57	.61	.39	-.27	.48 <sub>c</sub>	-.89	.53
United States	.39	.56	.37	.41 <sub>a</sub>	-.34	.51	-.59	.48 <sub>b</sub>
Women	.42	.48	.49	.34 <sub>c</sub>	-.52	.43 <sub>c</sub>	-.58	.49
Men	.33	.51	.14	.42 <sub>c</sub>	-.005	.49 <sub>c</sub>	-.61	.46

NOTE: HI = independent, same status; HC = interdependent, same status; VI = independent, different status; and VC = interdependent, different status.

a. For one-way ANOVA, difference between cultures is significant,  $F(1, 202) = 28.06, p < .001$ .

b. For one-way ANOVA, difference between cultures is significant,  $F(1, 202) = 9.79, p = .002$ .

c. Difference within culture, between gender is significant at  $p < .01$ .

past studies have demonstrated gender differences with regard to these cultural orientations (Kurman & Sriram, 2002). Significant multivariate main effects were found for culture,  $F(4, 197) = 15.62, p < .001$ , and gender,  $F(4, 197) = 10.36, p < .001$ . There was no Culture  $\times$  Gender interaction,  $F(4, 197) = 0.89, ns$ .

When examining univariate effects on each of the orientations, several differences emerged as expected. For VI, significant culture,  $F(1, 203) = 6.52, p = .01$ , and gender,  $F(1, 203) = 37.82, p < .001$ , main effects were found such that Americans and men scored higher than Danes and women overall (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations). Significant culture,  $F(1, 203) = 46.92, p < .001$ , and gender,  $F(1, 203) = 20.97, p < .001$ , main effects also emerged for HC; these differences were opposite to those found for VI. For VC, a significant main effect of culture was found,  $F(1, 203) = 10.51, p < .001$ , such that Americans scored higher than Danes. No significant effects emerged for HI. Because the items tapping the HI orientation (e.g., "I am a unique individual") tend to focus more on individualistic than horizontal notions and are items with which all individualists might agree, it may not be surprising that this subscale did not discriminate well between two individualist countries. We return to this issue below. All cultural differences noted were as expected and gender differences were in line with previous research (Kurman & Sriram, 2002). Results of nonstandardized mean comparisons were similar except that the differences were not significant for HC. For HI, nonstandardized mean scores showed that the Americans scored significantly higher than Danes on this dimension.

### Value Survey

Table 5 presents mean scores for male and female participants by national culture and value dimension or value type. These data were analyzed using  $2 \times 2$  ANOVAs in which the constituents of the value dimension (or value type) were the dependent measures of interest and gender and national culture (Denmark, United States) were the between-subjects independent variables.

Results for Self-Enhancement (achievement and power value types) revealed a main effect for national culture,  $F(1, 226) = 6.04; p < .01$ . As expected, Americans rated this

**TABLE 5**  
**Study 2: Standardized Mean Scores and Standard Deviations**  
**for Value Types/Value Dimensions by National Culture and Gender**

Value	Denmark						United States					
	Men		Women		Overall		Men		Women		Overall	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Achievement	.04	.23	.23	.42	.12	.50 <sub>a</sub>	.42	.35	.43	.28	.42	.30 <sub>a</sub>
Power	-.66	.53	-.85	.48	-.75	.52	-.63 <sub>a</sub>	.67 <sub>b</sub>	-.98 <sub>a</sub>	.53 <sub>b</sub>	-.85	.61
Benevolence	.36 <sub>a</sub>	.34 <sub>b</sub>	.57 <sub>a</sub>	.23 <sub>b</sub>	.44	.32	.42	.33	.45	.31	.44	.32
Universalism	-.04	.48	.04	.46	.06	.47 <sub>a</sub>	-.27 <sub>b</sub>	.46	-.10 <sub>b</sub>	.40	-.16 <sub>a</sub>	.43
Self-Enhancement	-.36	.42	-.36	.39	-.34	.41 <sub>a</sub>	-.11 <sub>a</sub>	.42 <sub>b</sub>	-.28 <sub>a</sub>	.33 <sub>b</sub>	-.21	.38 <sub>a</sub>
Self-Transcendence	.20	.30	.33	.29	.25	.30 <sub>a</sub>	.07	.27	.18	.24	.14	.26 <sub>a</sub>

a. Difference between cultures is significant at  $p < .05$ .

b. Difference between cultures is significant at  $p < .01$ .

c. Difference within culture, between gender is significant at  $p < .01$ . **NOT IN TABLE; DELETE?**

d. Difference within culture, between gender is significant at  $p < .05$ . **NOT IN TABLE; DELETE?**

dimension significantly higher than did Danes. No other effects were significant. An examination of values within the Self-Enhancement dimension revealed distinct results for each value type. For the achievement value type (made up of successful, ambitious, capable, and influential values), a significant difference emerged for national culture,  $F(1, 226) = 28.72$ ,  $p < .001$ . Again, and as expected, Americans rated this value type significantly higher than did Danes. No other effects were significant. For the power value type (made up of social power, authority, and wealth values), there was no significant difference between cultures,  $F(1, 226) = .28$ , *ns*, but men rated this value significantly higher than women,  $F(1, 226) = 10.67$ ,  $p < .001$ . The interaction was not significant.

For the Self-Transcendence dimension (benevolence and universalism value types), the analysis revealed significant main effects for culture,  $F(1, 226) = 7.63$ ,  $p = .006$ , and gender,  $F(1, 226) = 9.74$ ,  $p = .002$ , such that Danes and women rated such values as being more important than did Americans and men, respectively. There was no significant interaction. For the benevolence value type (values of helpful, honest, forgiving, responsibility, loyalty, true friendship, mature love, and meaning in life), women provided significantly higher ratings than men,  $F(1, 226) = 7.05$ ,  $p < .01$ , but there was no effect for culture,  $F(1, 226) = .40$ , *ns*, and there was no interaction. The gender differences are in line with findings that U.S. women rate benevolence values higher than U.S. men do (e.g., Feather, 1998; Feather et al., 1992). The analysis for universalism (protecting the environment, a world of beauty, unity with nature, broad-minded, social justice, wisdom, equality, and a world at peace values) showed that Danes gave significantly higher ratings to this value type than did Americans,  $F(1, 226) = 8.55$ ,  $p < .001$ . This is consistent with the differences that emerged in the depth interviews in Study 1. In addition, women gave significantly higher ratings to the universalism value type than did men,  $F(1, 226) = 3.69$ ,  $p = .05$ . The interaction was not significant. Results of nonstandardized mean scores were similar, except that Americans rated power and benevolence values significantly higher than did Danes.

### Relations Between I/C and Achievement Values

To explore relations between cultural orientations and values, bivariate correlations were examined (see Table 6). Given the conceptual definitions offered for horizontal and vertical orientations (Singelis & Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) and results of prior research (Oishi et al., 1998), it was expected that horizontal orientations would be positively correlated with Self-Transcendence and its value types and that vertical orientations would be negatively correlated with them. Similarly, it was expected that vertical orientations (VC and VI) would be positively correlated with Self-Enhancement and its value types (e.g., achievement) and that horizontal orientations (HI and HC) would be negatively correlated with them. Across Denmark and the United States, correlations supported these expectations. Self-Transcendence and the benevolence and universalism value types that comprise it were correlated positively with HC (and sometimes VC in Denmark) and negatively with VI. Conversely, Self-Enhancement and the power and achievement value types that comprise it were correlated positively with VI and negatively with HC and VC. These findings indicate that cultural orientations relate to achievement values in very similar ways in the United States and Denmark, with achievement linking to VI in these individualist cultures.

### DISCUSSION

Results of this quantitative study revealed that Danes and Americans differed significantly along horizontal and vertical collectivist orientations (except on the HI subscale). As expected and consistent with Study 1, Americans were more vertical than the Danes and the Danes were more horizontal than the Americans. Cultural differences also emerged in the value ratings. As expected, and in line with Study 1, the values of Americans were more achievement oriented than those of Danes—more oriented toward success, ambition, and gaining influence. In contrast, the values of Danes were more universalistic than those of Americans—more oriented toward nature, social justice, and equality.

Gender differences showed that women scored higher on HC and lower on VI than did their male counterparts. The former finding is consistent with research conducted among Israeli and Singaporean men and women (Kurman & Sriram, 2002). For values ratings, our findings with respect to gender differences were also consistent with past research. Namely, women tend to rate benevolence values higher than men do (e.g., Feather, 1998; Feather et al., 1992). Women were also found to be more universalistic and less power oriented. However, ratings for achievement values did not differ by gender. This last finding may reflect the values of the well-educated middle class samples in Denmark and the United States in these studies, or it could be due to changing societal norms associated with women and career success.

Finally, correlations of cultural orientation and value ratings demonstrated a shared understanding of achievement across Denmark and the United States. In both cultures, a VI orientation appears associated with strong achievement and power values, whereas collectivist orientations are negatively associated with such values. Implications for conceptualizing achievement in individualist cultures are discussed below.

**TABLE 6**  
**Relations Between Cultural Orientations and**  
**Values via Correlational Analyses by National Culture**

Value	Cultural Orientation							
	HC		HI		VC		VI	
	Denmark	United States	Denmark	United States	Denmark	United States	Denmark	United States
Achievement	-.22*	-.22*	.04	.02	-.25*	-.11	.29*	.29**
Power	-.46**	-.45**	-.14	-.14	-.24*	-.20*	.47**	.58**
Benevolence	.26*	.25*	-.06	-.24*	.13	.09	-.29*	-.14
Universalism	.60**	.34**	.12	.34**	.28*	-.03	-.48**	-.35**
Self-Enhancement	-.44**	-.46**	-.07	-.10	-.32*	-.21*	.50**	.59**
Self-Transcendence	.61**	.45**	.06	-.03	.29*	.04	-.53**	-.40**

NOTE: HC = interdependent, same status; HI = independent, same status; VC = interdependent, different status; and VI = independent, different status.

\*Correlation is significant at  $p < .05$ .

\*\*Correlation is significant at  $p < .01$ .

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

Taken together, these studies demonstrate the value of multiple methods in cross-cultural research. Consistencies were found in the importance ascribed to values across methods and samples. Americans' responses to in-depth interview questions corresponded with their high quantitative ratings, compared to Danes, of achievement as an enduring value and life-guiding principle. U.S. participants readily identified with the achievement (but not necessarily materialist) aspects of the American Dream. These results reinforce a view of U.S. culture as one that emphasizes individual achievement and the importance of recognizing and rewarding success (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995a).

Although Danes felt ambivalent about the Jante Law, sentiments consistent with this modesty code emerged in response to in-depth questions and in Danes' lower quantitative ratings of achievement values. Danish informants primarily wished for a family and a modest amount of money and success. This might be expected of a culture in which its ruler (Queen Margrethe II) proclaimed, "We are very proud of our modesty. It is our inverted megalomania. It is highly sophisticated" (Askgaard, 1992, p. 8). The "Danish way" is not to rise above others. This was supported by the fact Danes gave higher importance ratings than Americans to universalism values. Such values are related to the Jante Law and the Danish social and economic system in their emphasis on social justice and equality.

Importantly, the cultural differences in achievement were related to differences in H/V dimensions within I/C. Higher scores on VI correlated with higher scores on achievement (and power) values for U.S. informants, whereas lower scores on horizontal measures (HC) coincided with lower scores for achievement (and power) values among Danes. Indeed, the H/V distinction was able to discriminate well between two individualistic national cultures. As such, this research joins a growing number of studies that have successfully employed the H/V distinction within I/C to better understand cultural values (e.g., Singelis & Triandis, 1995; Chiu, 2001). As expected, Danes were found to be somewhat more horizontally oriented than Americans, and Americans were found to be more vertically oriented than Danes. This difference emerged in the scenario responses in Study 1 and the rating scales in Study 2.

The pattern generally corresponds with assumptions about the relatively horizontal, egalitarian nature of Scandinavian societies compared to the United States (e.g., Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). However, it does not suggest that the United States is a vertical society. Across the measures we employed, respondents in both cultures were much more horizontally than vertically oriented. For U.S. participants, these results support Triandis's (1995a) suggestion that Americans are moving to a more horizontal orientation. This may be particularly true of a sample of (on average) 20-year-olds who may be more focused on equality and freedom (hallmarks of an HI orientation; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) than are older Americans. Indeed, our nonstandardized U.S. data were consistent with the findings of previous research on U.S. university students in revealing higher scores on HI than on any other cultural orientation (Choiu, 2001; Singelis & Triandis, 1995).

It should also be noted that, in Study 2, the Danes appeared to score higher on HC than on the HI dimension. Although they have been described as extremely self-reliant and independent (indicative of individualistic cultures), Danes and other Scandinavians have been described as moderately individualistic with "many horizontal collectivist elements" (Triandis, 1995a, p. 99). The tendency toward HC corresponds to the observation by Sir James Mellon, the British Ambassador to Denmark (1983-1986), that "Denmark is not a nation but a tribe" (Hastrup, 1995, p. 257). Anthropologist G. Prakash Reddy (1993) drew similar conclusions. Indeed, Triandis and Gelfand's (1998) suggestion that "in HC, people see themselves as being similar to others . . . and emphasize common goals with others" (p. 119) resonates with this view of Denmark's highly homogeneous population.

The findings could also be due, in part, to the nature of the scale used in Study 2 (Singelis & Triandis, 1995). Contrary to expectations, no significant cultural differences emerged for the HI subscale. Perhaps this is because the items tapping this orientation (e.g., "I am a unique individual") tend to focus more on individualistic than horizontal notions and are items with which all individualists might agree. Therefore, it is not surprising that this subscale did not discriminate well between two individualist countries. Alternatively, the lack of differences for HI in this study may be explained by comparing alpha levels across national cultures. Given the differential reliability of the HI subscale across cultures, it is likely that the measure was not able to capture true differences.

This study also suggests that cultural orientations relate to achievement values in similar ways across two Western Individualist cultures. In Denmark and the United States, VI was associated with strong achievement values, whereas collectivist orientations were negatively correlated with achievement values. These results offer evidence that achievement is conceptualized at the individual level within these cultures in a way that emphasizes interpersonal competition and hierarchies. In these cultural contexts, efforts for personal achievement are in opposition to collectivist values that stress ingroup obligations (VC) or sociability (HC). Future studies could examine these relationships in collectivist cultures, where research suggests that achievement is conceptualized differently (e.g., Fyans et al., 1983; Phalet & Lens, 1995; Yu & Yang, 1994; for evidence that VI and achievement values correlate positively in Singapore, see Soh & Leong, 2002).

The limitations of this research include the potential for interviewer and experimenter effects (Malpass, 1977), especially with respect to the Danish informants. Although one of the authors is a Danish American, he or she was identified primarily as an American outsider and therefore responses to some of the questions may have been influenced by social desirability concerns. The use of English in the Danish interviews may also have influenced the nature of responses, given the fact that bilinguals may respond in a way that corresponds to the cultural values associated with the language they are speaking (Bond & Yang, 1982).

However, given the fact that Danes' values obtained through quantitative surveys administered in Danish in Study 2 closely matched those obtained in English (Study 1), it does not appear that language greatly influenced the nature of responses in Study 1. In addition, member checks with key Danish informants in Study 1 were conducted to enhance the validity of interpretation.

Additional limitations correspond to sample composition. First, the respondents were not representative of their national populations. The variables of interest (values) may be dependent on age and education (Feather, 1994). Future research could examine the degree to which such demographic factors are associated with particular values in both national cultures. In addition, in Study 1, informants were recruited via snowball method from a few key individuals, which raises the possibility that informants were of a like mind. Interview informants did vary in terms of age, occupation, gender, and geographic location. Still, a broader and more representative sample of respondents would be desirable. Indeed, a larger sampling of multiple HI and VI societies would be useful for establishing the generalizability of the link between VI and achievement values.

## REFERENCES

- Amir, Y., & Sharon, I. (1987). Are social psychological laws cross-culturally valid? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 383-470.
- Askgaard, H. (1992). As Denmark sees herself and is seen by others. In P. Himmelstrup, K. Hegelund, H. Askgaard (Eds.), *Discover Denmark—On Denmark and the Danes: Past, present and future* (pp. 7-26). Herning, Denmark: The Danish Cultural Institute, Copenhagen and Systime Publishers.
- Bond, M. H. (1988). *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bond, M. H., & Yang, K. S. (1982). Ethnic affirmation versus cross-cultural accommodation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13*, 169-185.
- Campbell, D. T. (1986). Science's social system of validity-enhancing collective belief change and the problems of the social sciences. In D. W. Fiske & R. A. Shweder (Eds.), *Metatheory in social science* (pp. 108-135). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Choiu, J. (2001). Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism among college students in the United States, Taiwan, and Argentina. *Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(5), 667-678.
- de Mooij, M. (1998). *Global marketing and advertising*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daun, A. (1991). Individualism and collectivity among Swedes. *Ethnos, 56*, 165-172.
- Daun, A. (1992). Modern and modest: Mentality and self-stereotypes among Swedes. In A. Sjoegren & L. Janson (Eds.), *Culture and management* (pp. 101-111). Stockholm, Sweden: Institution for International Business.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Feather, N. T. (1994). Values and culture. In W. J. Lonner & R. S. Malpass (Eds.), *Psychology and culture* (pp. 183-190). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Feather, N. T. (1998). Attitudes toward high achievers, self-esteem, and value priorities for Australian, American, and Canadian students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(6), 749-759.
- Feather, N. T., Volkmer, R. E., & McKee, I. R. (1992). A comparative study of the value priorities of Australians, Australian Baha'is, and Expatriate Iranian Baha'is. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23*(1), 95-106.
- Fyans, L. J., Jr., Maehr, M. L., Salili, F., & Desai, K. A. (1983). A cross-cultural exploration into the meaning of achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 1000-1013.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Grunert, S. C., & Juhl, H. J. (1995). Values, environmental attitudes, and buying of organic foods. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 16*, 39-62.
- Hastrup, B. (1995). *Contemporary Danish society: Danish democracy and social welfare*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Reproset I/S.
- Himmelstrup, P. (1992). *Discover Denmark*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Det Danske Kulturinstitut.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultures consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Horner, M. S. (1972). Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*, 157-176.

- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1985). Measurement in cross-cultural psychology: A review and comparison of strategies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 16*, 131-152.
- Isherwood, J. (1992). As others see us. In P. Himmelstrup (Ed.), *Discover Denmark* (pp. 195-208). Copenhagen, Denmark: Det Danske Kulturinstitut.
- Kurman, J., & Sriram, N. (2002). Interrelationships among vertical and horizontal collectivism, modesty, and self-enhancement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(1), 71-86.
- Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1989). On the empirical identification of dimensions for cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20*, 133-151.
- Lindlof, T. R. (1995). *Qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maheswaran, D., & Shavitt, S. (2000). Issues and new directions in global consumer psychology. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9*(2), 59-66.
- Malpass, R. S. (1977). Theory and method in cross-cultural psychology. *American Psychologist, 32*, 1069-1079.
- Marascuilo, L. A., & Serlin, R. C. (1988). *Statistical methods for the social & behavioral sciences*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Cultural variation in the self-concept. In J. Strauss & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), *The self: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 18-48). New York: Springer Verlag.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C. (1963). Motivational patterns in Southeast Asia with special reference to the Chinese case. *Journal of Social Issues, 19*, 6-19.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Miller, J. G. (2001). The cultural grounding of social psychological theory. In A. Tesser & N. Schwartz (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intraindividual processes* (pp. 22-43). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Miracle, G. E. (1988). An empirical study of the usefulness of the back-translation technique for international advertising messages in print media. In J. D. Leckenby (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1988 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising* (pp. 51-56). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin.
- Monahan, L., Kuhn, D., & Shaver, P. (1974). Intrapyschic versus cultural explanations of the "fear of success" motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29*(1), 60-64.
- Niles, S. (1998). Achievement goals and means: A cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(5), 656-667.
- Oishi, S., Schimmack, U., Diener, E., & Suh, E. M. (1998). The measurement of values and individualism-collectivism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*(11), 1177-1189.
- Phalet, K., & Lens, W. (1995). Achievement motivation and group loyalty among Turkish and Belgian youth. In P. Pintrich & M. Maehr (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (pp. 31-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Phalet, K., & Schonpflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of collectivism and achievement values in two acculturation contexts: The case of Turkish families in Germany and Turkish and Moroccan families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*(2), 186-201.
- Pollay, R. W. (1987). On the value of reflections on the values in "the distorted mirror." *Journal of Marketing, 51*(3), 104-109.
- Reddy, G. P. (1993). *Danes are like that! Perspectives of an Indian anthropologist on the Danish Society*. Mørke, Denmark: Grevas.
- Rodnick, D. (1955). *The Norwegians*. Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press.
- Sandemose, A. (1933). *A refugee crosses his tracks*. Norway: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1-65). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 19-45.
- Schwartz, S. (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium* (pp. 1-24). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 550-562.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(5), 878-891.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26*(1), 92-116.
- Singelis, T. M., & Triandis, H. C. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29*(3), 240-276.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research, 29*, 240-275.
- Social challenges and mutual responsibility. (1997, January). *Denmark Review*, pp. 2-3.
- Soh, S., & Leong, F. T. L. (2002). Validity of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism in Singapore. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(1), 3-15.

- Spence, J. (1985). Achievement American style: The rewards and costs of individualism. *American Psychologist*, 40(12), 1285-1295.
- Strange, M. (1996). *Culture shock: A guide to customs in Denmark*. Portland, OR: Graphic Arts Center.
- Tagil, S. (1995). *Ethnicity and nation building in the Nordic world*. London: C. Hurst.
- Tawney, R. H. (1926). *Religion and the rise of capitalism*. Gloucester, MA: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995a). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995b). Motivation and achievement in collectivist and individualist cultures. In M. L. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (pp. 1-30). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, D. K. S. (1998). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(2), 275-289.
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118-129.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 1006-1020.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (2000). Methodological issues in psychological research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(1), 33-51.
- Wallechinsky, D. (1997, April 13). Are we still number one? *Parade Magazine*, pp. 4-7.
- Weldon, E. (1984). Deindividuation, interpersonal affect, and productivity in laboratory task groups. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 469-485.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles J. S. (1994). Children's competence beliefs, achievement values, and general self-esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14(2), 107-139.
- World Factbook (2000). Langley, VA: Central Intelligence Agency. Retrieved from <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/>.
- Yu, A. B., & Yang, K. S. (1994). The nature of achievement motivation in collectivist societies. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 239-250). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Michelle R. Nelson received her Ph.D. from the Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1997. She is an assistant professor in the School of Journalism & Mass Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her research focuses on cultural values as they relate to communication, persuasion, and consumer behavior.*

*Sharon Shavitt received her Ph.D. in social psychology from The Ohio State University in 1985. She is a professor in the Department of Business Administration and the Department of Psychology and research professor at the Survey Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her research interests are at the intersection of social psychology and consumer behavior and focus in particular on cross-cultural factors affecting consumer persuasion and survey responding.*