Where is Iranian culture go? Individualism or collectivism?

Hadizade moghaddam, Akram (PHD). Associate professor of Shahid Beheshti university, Tehran, Iran

Mohammadipour pamsari*, Masoome. MA of International trade management. Shahid Beheshti university, Tehran, Iran(Corresponding Author)

Mesbahi jahromi, Negar. MA of International trade management. Shahid Beheshti university, Tehran, Iran

Abstract: In this paper we examine the amount of individualism and collectivism between different age groups of Iranian community. We use from the questionare method for collecting data and SPSS software for analysing them. We examine the individualism and collectivism between groups through the four dimentions that Triandis has offer in 1990. These dimentions are horizontal individualism, vertical individualism, horizontal individualism and vertical collectivism. After analysing data, we conclude that in three dimention include of horizontal individualism, vertical individualism and vertical collectivism Iranian culture is moving to individualism but in the horizontal collectivism tendency to be collectivist is high like the past.

Introduction

In the past 3 decades, Hofstede's (1984, 2001) work-related cultural dimensions were used as research paradigm in the field of intercultural communication, cross cultural psychology, and international management. His country classification on five work-related cultural values, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, individualism-collectivism, and Confucian work dynamics, has been frequently cited by researchers in the past few decades. While his work has been used effectively, his data were collected 30 years ago and have become dated. (Wu, 2006) Hofstede's (1984) *Culture's Consequences* explores the domain of studying international organizations. He collected data from a large multinational corporation, IBM, and analyzed data collected from forty different countries. Through his empirical data analysis, he concluded that "organizations are cultural-bounded" (p. 252). In addition, he identified four work-related cultural dimensions, including power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity, to analyze work-related cultural values in different countries. (Wu, 2006)

Between cultural variables that hofsted has been explained, the focus of our paper will be on individualism and collectivism. The behavior of an individual will be affected from different factors that one of most phandamental of them is cultural and familiar context of a society. Culture is a wide collection of customes, rules and values that are dominant on a society which during the lifetime of a person will be internalize and affect the attitude and behavior of them. From the most known type of cultural pattern is individualism and collectivism (Triandis, 1988) which have attracted the attention of many researchers. Accessing to the reliable and validable tools for measuring individualism and collectivism is so important, because the attitude, perception, belief and behavior of individuals in a society are influenced from the tendency to be individualist or collectivist Shakiba et al, 2011). Dividing the communities to teo groups of individualist or collectivist is not easy; because the criteria of this classification "which is the amount of attention to the individual or group needs" has a Broad spectrum. This means that we can not say that a community is exactly individualist or collectivist and another one is in other way.)Triandis et al, 1990(One of societies that hofested has been examined is Iran which in the individualism variable has the scale of 41, thus this meanes that Iran is a collectivist country.

Cultural theorists generally agree that values championed by a society are the product of a complex historical process involving all domains of social, economic, and political life. From an adaptionist angle, cultural systems can be examined as the product of the interaction of a people with their ecological, geographical, and climatic environment (e.g., Cohen, 2001; Diamond, 1997; Harris, 1968). Emphasizing more the dynamics of cultural evolution, modernity theorists, starting with Karl Marx (1973), have proposed that cultural values evolve along a predictable trajectory (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Inkeles&Smith, 1974). As traditional societies advance technologically, they assume new modes of production, leading to a revolution in the nature of

work and an increase in societal wealth (Bell, 1973; Inglehart, 1997). Such far-reaching economic transformations are thought to be reflected in dramatic changes in people's priorities, shifting them from concerns about survival and economic security to the goal of self actualization. Specifically, in the social realm modernity theorists propose that traditional values emphasizing adherence to social norms and submission to established authority give way to values focusing on individual self-determination (Inglehart, 1990, 1997).

Even though cultural change is certainly not uniform across different societies (e.g., Inglehart & Baker, 2000), this trend from tradition to modernity is exemplified in the emergence of individualist values, which typically occurred on the background of a restrictive social order. Historically, individualism is a product of the ideology of liberalism whose emphasis on civic liberties and freedom emerged in opposition to authoritarian oppression during the late 18th and 19th century, especially the American Revolution and French revolution (cf. Gelfand, Triandis,&Chan, 1996; Lukes, 1973; Triandis, 1995). The central idea of these and similar political movements was the recognition of individual self-determination, individual human rights, and the limitation of state control over the individual ideas that form the philosophical cornerstone of today's civic democracies. As a consequence, the cultural ideology of individualism appears to be diametrically opposed to the notion of conformity to the group and subordination to authority. (Kemmelmeier et al, 2003)

Iran in last years has different historical periods and social, political and economical factors such as Islamic revolution, imposed war from Iraq, multiple boycotts and many development in scientific fields and technology has impact on it. All of these factors may have impact on cultural structure of Iranians through the years. Thus the amount of individualism or collectivism may be different between different age groups and may be it has opposit tendency from its previous trend.

So in this research, we examine the tendency to be individualist or collectivist between defferent ages groups from Iranian community. And also we discuss that the Iranian culture is moving through which side? Individualism or collectivism. These ages groups are: befor revolution generation that now have 51to 65 years old, revolution generation that now have 36 to 50 years old, after revolution generation that now have 21 to 35 years old which are young and the densely populated generation of iran and the fourth generation that have no contributions in the revolution and now have 15 to 20 years old. The

phenomenon of generation gap in iran, has lead to fundamental changes such as social imbalances and value and normative changes. The third and fourth generation has different, not opposite, nature from first and second generation and don't follow its manner. The generation gap between first and second generation with third and fourth generation don't means the collapse and lost of identity in new generation, as it don't shows the unreliability of previous generations. (Bozorgian, 2008, Aftab web site). The increasement of population after revolution of Iran has lead to the young population which have various demand and expectation from the brokers of country. These expectations have broad and wide range because of different needs and wants of youth. It is obvious that many of these expectations have no agreements with cultural believes of society. But the question that what should we do and from which site shold see the problem, needs more scientific researches about the transition of values and social-cultural phenomenons(alikhani, 1382). Thus the purpose of this paper is to answer this question that different age groups in iran are moving through which side from the individualism or collectivism perspective. Do historical periods and social, cultural and economical problems in different periods have impact on the trend of individualism or collectivism? And where is iranian culture go? Individualism or collectivism?

Literature Review

The finding that collectivism and individualism influences people's behaviors is very robust. Among the typical findings are that collective societies emphasize group goals (e.g., Ali, Taqi, & Krishnan, 1997), focus more in group harmony (e.g., Chen & Pan, 1993) and assign rewards in a more egalitarian manner (e.g., Bond, Leung, & Wan, 1982). Cooperation is assumed to be motivated by outcomes that benefit the group. In individualist societies, on the other hand, individuals presumably place more emphasis on self-interest and independence and seek to maximize individual goals (e.g., Wagner & Moch, 1986). (Koch & Koch, 2007)

A large amount of research has documented the prevalence of individualism in Western societies and of collectivism in East Asian societies (Fiske, Kitayama, Markus & Nisbett, 1998; Triandis,1995) (Testé, 2012) Hofstede (1980) introduced the IC variable as a cultural level variable to the international management literature. Later studies (e.g. Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Wagner, 1995) have treated the IC variable as an individual difference variable and have also shown that at the individual level IC is a multi-dimensional variable. Stated broadly, individualism refers to an orientation towards self as an autonomous individual and

collectivism refers to an orientation towards self as embedded in a larger collective and in a rubric of complex relationships. In individualistic societies, an individual's identity and individual interests are paramount whereas in collectivistic societies an individual's identity is submerged in the group. Also, in these societies group interests and goals are paramount over individual goals and interests. To enhance individual achievements and progress, individualistic societies emphasize competitiveness and equity to a greater extent than collectivist societies. Collectivist societies, on the other hand, emphasize equality and cooperation more than individualistic societies. (Ramamoorthy et al, 2005) Individualism-collectivism is a commonly used dimension in cross-cultural research (Hofstede, 1980; Hui, 1988; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Ting-Toomey, 1988; Triandis, 1988). Individualists value the goals, needs, and rights of the individual over the goals, responsibilities, and obligations of the group. Collectivists value the goals, responsibilities, and obligations of the group over the goals, needs, and rights of the individual. Because individuals in collectivist cultures define themselves in terms of relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), the ingroup is considered to be more important within collectivist cultures than within individualist cultures (Triandis, 1988).(Cai & Fink,2002) In several of studies people from collectivist cultures were found to be less confrontational than people from individualist cultures. Chua and Gudykunst (1987), for example, compared students from 37 countries studying in the United States. Using an a priori categorization based on country of origin, students from high context cultures (who are assumed to be collectivist) were found to be significantly less confrontational than students from low context cultures (who are assumed to be individualist) (Cai & Fink, 2002) An IND culture such as that in the United States endorses being independent and pursuing personal goals, whereas a COL culture such as that in China and Korea endorses being interdependent and pursuing in-group goals. (Zhang, 2010) Hofstede (1994) indicated that individualism prevails in developed and Western countries and collectivism in developing and Eastern countries because industrialization reinforces individualism. Hui (1988) suggested that I/C influences decision style and that in a collective culture there is a reliance on group decisions. Similarly, Bond et al. (1982) argued that collectivism entails the need to preserve group harmony and consequently engenders styles to facilitate that goal. These researchers suggested that in general there is a correspondence between I/C and decision styles. In a collective culture, the emphasis is on decision styles that maintain and reinforce

consensus (e.g., consultative, participative), whereas, in an individualistic culture, styles that maximize or serve individual interests are adopted. (Ali et al, 1997)

Individualist and collectivist constructs are a theme of multidisciplinary interest; economists (Hayek, 1948), anthropologists (Dumont, 1987), sociologists (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1989; Parsons & Shils, 195 1/1968), historians (Gurevich, 1995), philosophers (Elias, 1990), and educators (Watt, 1989), among others, consider those constructs in their analyses. Nevertheless, to date it seems that psychologists who have used the theoretical framework described by Hofstede (1984) have gathered most of the empirical data. (Gouveia et al, 2003). After 20 years of research, there remain several stereotyped notions about individualism and collectivism (Kagitqibasi, 1997), and as yet no one has proposed a theoretical model with sound consistency. An exception to that statement is Triandis's typology (1995); that work consists of the empirical evidence about those constructs..(Gouveia et al,2003)

The Dimensionality of Individualism and Collectivism Constructs:

Hofstede (1980; 1983) reports on an analysis of four dimensions of culture across 39 countries. He defines culture as:

`The collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another' (Hofstede 1983 p. 21).

Hofstede's four dimensions of culture are:

1) Individualism, as an opposite to collectivism. Individualism reflects the extent to which the individual expects personal freedom. It contrasts with collectivism which is defined as the acceptance of responsibility to family, tribal, or national groups.

2) Power distance. This is defined as: `The power distance between a boss B and a subordinate S in a hierarchy is the difference

between the extent to which B can determine the behaviour of S and the extent to which S can determine the behaviour of B' (Hofstede 1983 p 22). In a large power distance society there is acceptance of hierarchy and no call for its justification. In small power distance societies there is an aspiration for power equalisation and a demand that inequalities be justified.

3) Uncertainty avoidance. Uncertainty about the future is a basic fact of human life. High uncertainty societies reduce the impact of uncertainty by technology, rules and rituals. Low uncertainty avoidance societies are more relaxed, so that practice counts more than principles and deviance is more tolerated.

4) Masculinity, as against femininity. Masculine values emphasise values of performance and visible achievement. Feminine values incline towards a preference for quality of life, relationships, modesty and caring for the weak. (Hofstede,1983)

Hofstede (1984) initially proposed an individualism index, a one-dimensional view of human values, with individualism and collectivism conceived of as the extremes of a continuum. National cultures were defined as adhering to one or the other of those extremes (or between them). The impact of Hofstede's work is still relevant today because, in many studies, a person's nationality is regarded as an indication of his or her individualistic or collectivistic tendencies (Bontempo, Lobel, & Triandis, 1990; Leung, Au, Fernhndez-Dols, & Iwawaki, 1992). The influence of Hofstede's model is still evident at the level of individual analysis (Chan, 1994), although Rhee, Uleman, and Lee (1996) have expressed their doubts. For them, the correlations found by Chan do not sufficiently define individualism-collectivism as a single dimension. Triandis, Brislin, et al. (1988) noted that collectivists prefer a vertical rather than a horizontal relation, giving rise to studies concerned with the different types of self private, public, or collective (Trafimow, Triandis, & Goto, 1991) and independent or interdependent (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The different types of self are not opposite views of the self, however: Each person has a private (which includes an emphasis on internal abilities, thoughts, feelings, and being unique) and a collective (which emphasizes external, public features such as roles and relationships) self-construal. Singelis (1994) supported the notion that those attributes can and do coexist in individuals. Consequently, the advanceshave highlighted the need for a new typology, which has recently been developed (for further references, see Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, 1995).(Gouveia et al,2003)

Triandis (1995) contends that individualism and collectivism can be identified by examining the following tendencies:

(a) to define the self, which may emphasise personal or collective aspects or may be independent or interdepend(Triandis, 1989; Markus & Kitayama, 1991),

(b) to prioritise in group goals over personal goals or vice versa (Triandis, 1990; Yamaguchi, 1994),

(c) to emphasise on exchange rather than communal relationships (Mills & Clark, 1982), or rationality rather than relatedness (Kim et al., 1994) and

(d) to give importance to attitude and norms as determinants of social behavior (Davidson et al.,

1994; Bontempo & Rivero, 1992). (Verma,2001) It has been suggested that the most important attributes that distinguish among the different kinds of individualism-collectivism, refer to the emphases on horizontal and vertical social relationships (Triandis, 1990; 1995). (Verma,2001)

Triandis 's Typology of Individualism and Collectivism:

Each type of individualism and collectivism established by Triandis (1995) can be characterized by the following personal attributes (in parentheses): *horizontal individualism (uniqueness), vertical individualism (achievement orientation), horizontal collectivism (cooperativeness), and vertical collectivism (dutifulness).*

In the first type, the self is independent and is the same as the others; in the second, it is independent and different from the others; it is interdependent and the same as the others in the third and is interdependent and different from the others in the fourth. In the model, the participants obtain four scores that classify them according to one of the two orientations and the horizontal or the vertical attribute, rather than simply as individualistic or collectivistic. Triandis pointed out that there is a certain degree of parallelism with Fiske's (1992) typology of four kinds of sociality, and in our view, there is a degree of overlapping with the model described by Parsons and Shils (195 1/1968) in terms of the cornbination of two of their pattern variables: universalism-particularism and ascription-achievement. Moreover, the theoretical framework does not imply that individualism and collectivism are inherently opposites, because they can coexist, as Sinha and Tripathi (1994) have shown, or are at least orthogonal (Gelfand, Triandis, & Chan, 1996).

In Triandis's typology, the interpersonal relationships and the individual's identification with the in-group are key factors in the definition of individualism and collectivism (Hui, 1988; Triandis, 1995). On the whole, individualists have a tendency to have more in-groups than collectivists do, but their relationships are casual and superficial, with little involvement and intimacy among the members, whereas collectivists are generally less likely to make new friends, but their relationships are intimate (see Gouveia, 1998; Gouveia & Clemente, 2000). Variations can also be found within each subtype: Horizontal individualists value their independence, and horizontal collectivists value their interdependence (Singelis et al., 1995); vertical individualists ascribe importance to horizontal relationships in their peer group, and vertical collectivists emphasize the importance of a hierarchy in vertical relationship (Chen, Meindl, & Hunt, 1997).

To examine the identification with the in-groups, Rhee et al. (1996) used the LISREL 7 program to test several models for the description of individualism and Collectivism.

The most appropriate model, according to those authors, is the model that consists of four factors: Kin Collectivism, Kin Individualism, Non-Kin Collectivism, and Non-Kin Individualism. Moreover, their theory is based on the premise that "if in-groups differ in influence and elicit qualitatively different behaviors because the goals, needs, and motives of individuals differ across various interactions, then collectivistic and individualistic orientations may not generalize across all in-groups" (p. 1038). That observation suggests that collectivists have a greater tendency than individualists to believe and behave differentially toward members of the in-group than toward members of an out group (see Triandis, 1995); interdependence is typical of collectivism and is the nexus between the I and the others (Kim, 1994; Singelis, 1994; Singelis et al., 1995).

In comparison with individualists, collectivists exhibit ties of mutual support; that is, they help and expect to be helped (Fijneman et al., 1996). (Gouveia et al, 2003)

The present findings showed that (at an individual level of analysis and treated as multidimensional constructs) individualism and collectivism are not opposing poles of the same dimension. That is not to say, however, that in some cultures one of the two dimensions might not predominate. As Hofstede (1991, p. 5 1) pointed out, "extreme collectivism and extreme individualism can be considered as the opposite poles." Nevertheless, such a polarity seems to be the exception rather than the rule. Although, in the vast majority of cases, one specific dimension and attribute might prevail, a zero score is not obtained in the other dimensions; that is, those dimensions are not excluded. The same culture or person might be individualist or collectivist (allocentric or idiocentric), depending on that person's or culture's situation. Nevertheless, the individual or the culture can be classified according to the predominance of the two dimensions across different situations (Triandis, 1995).(Gouveia et al, 2003)

Individualism-collectivism. The original individualism-collectivism (INDCOL) scale developed by Hui and Triandis (1986) consists of 66 Likert-type scale items used to assess an individual's level of collectivism by measuring attitudes and behaviors toward six relational domains (e.g., co-workers, neighbors). Participants were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each item (1 _ strongly disagree; 7 _ strongly agree). This scale was modified for our study in three steps. First,

22 items were deleted that lacked clarity or face validity. Next, the remaining 44 items were assessed for internal consistency and parallelism using confirmatory factor analysis (Hunter, 1980). This analysis resulted in three subscales, one each for family, neighbor, and colleague. The three subscales were used to form a single scale with 11 items (see Table 2 for items). (Cai & Fink,2002) The results of the more recent study have brought significant insights to the field of cross cultural communication in the organizational context. (Wu, 2006)

Defining Research Hypotheses

Following the literature and the main questions of this research the Hypotheses of this research are as below:

H1: the amount of horizontal individualism isnt same in different age groups.

H1a: the amount of horizontal individualism is the most in first age group.

H1b: the amount of horizontal individualism is the most in second age group.

H1c: the amount of horizontal individualism is the most in third age group.

H1d: the amount of horizontal individualism is the most in fourth age group.

H2: the amount of vertical individualism isnt same in different age groups.

H2a: the amount of vertical individualism is the most in first age group.

H2b: the amount of vertical individualism is the most in second age group.

H2c: the amount of vertical individualism is the most in third age group.

H2d: the amount of vertical individualism is the most in fourth age group.

H3: the amount of horizontal collectivism isnt same in different age groups.

H3a: the amount of horizontal collectivism is the most in first age group.

H3b: the amount of horizontal collectivism is the most in second age group.

H3c: the amount of horizontal collectivism is the most in third age group.

H3d: the amount of horizontal collectivism is the most in fourth age group.

H4: the amount of vertical collectivism isnt same in different age groups.

H4a: the amount of vertical collectivism is the most in first age group.

H4b: the amount of vertical collectivism is the most in second age group.

H4c: the amount of vertical collectivism is the most in third age group.

H4d: the amount of vertical collectivism is the most in fourth age group.

Methodology

A total of 164 Iranian participants completed the study. Approximately even numbers of women *(n = 75)* and men *(n = 89)* participated. Their average age was 30 years (range 18-86 years). The participants were: Their average age was 30 years (range 15-86 years). The participants were mostly unmarried (70%).

Participants were given a questionnaire composed of two parts. The first part consisted of the Iranian version of the scale designed by Triandis et al. (1990) to measure the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the individualism and collectivism constructs. The participants responded to 32 items, using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 *(strongly disagree)* to 5 *(strongly agree).* The second part of thequestionnaire contained questions related to demographic variables such as gender, age, marital status and educational degree. Triandis et al. (1995) explained that the pool of 32 items was selected from a list of 94 items. After analyzing the contents, we reduced the list to 70 items, which were grouped into four categories according to the procedures established by Triandis and colleagues. We individually subjected the items belonging to each category to principal components analysis in order to select one component; those items that obtained a loading below.35 were eliminated. Finally, the four scales with 8 items each presented the following indices of internal consistency (Cronbach's *a):* For horizontal individualism (e.g., "I often do my own thing"; "I **am** a unique individual"), *a* =.67; for vertical individualism (e.g., "It annoys me when other people perform better than **I** do"; "Competition is the law of nature"), *a* =.74; for horizontal collectivism (e.g., "The well-being of my coworkers is important to me"; "To me, pleasure is spending time with others"), *01* =.74; and for vertical collectivism (e.g., "I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it"; "I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group"), *a* =.68.

The questionnaire was administered collectively in the classroom (to the undergraduate students) or individually at the participant's home (for the general population). Researchers informed the respondents that their participation was voluntary. The students were told that a week later they would be informed about our purpose in the study and that any questions would be answered; participants from the general population were given an address where they could get additional information about the study. On average, participants needed only about 15 min to complete the test instrument.

Analysis and Discussion

For analysing the data which obtained from questionare we use from the ANOVA and other tests such as Kruskal Wallis which exist in SPSS software. ANOVA is a way for comparing the means of different series of data. When the means between series are equal the H0 will accepted. In the result table if the significance level be lower than the accepted level of error, this means that the average between series of data are unequal. For the firs hyphothesis that is: the amount of horizontal individualism is same in different age groups. The table of result is as below:

ANOVA					
Table 1: Horizontal individualism					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.516	3	2.172	6.809	.000
Within Groups	51.035	160	.319		
Total	57.551	163			

ANOVA					
Table 4: Vertical individualism					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.765	3	3.255	12.789	.000
Within Groups	40.723	160	.255		
Total	50.488	163			

As we see in the error level of 0.05 the significance level of 0.000, it reveal that the means between 4 different age groups are different. And these groups are different from the point of horizontal individualism. Thus

the firs hyphotesis of our paper is accepted. For ranking the groups according to the amount of horizontal individualism we use from the Kruskal Wallis Test. The result are shown as below:

Table 2: Ranking of groups in Horizontal individualism			
	age	N	Mean Rank
Ho/ Ind	21-35	74	70.78
	36-50	39	72.06
	51-65	13	93.73
	18-21	38	112.18
	Total	164	

Table 3:Test Statistics[a,b]	
	Ho/Ind
Chi-Square	22.194
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. Kruskal Wallis Test	
b. Grouping Variable: age	

As the table show the amount of horizontal individualism is highest in the fourth age group with the mean of 112.18 which means that teenager and young people of Iranian which have 15-20 years old are at the top of horizontal individualism and the H1d is accepted.This revealed that according to this factor Iranian culture is moving toward individualism.

For the second hyphothesis which is: the amount of vertical individualism isnt same in different age groups. After entering data to the softwar the result revealed as below:

As it shown because the significance level is lower than error level of 0.05, the average between series are different thus the second hyphothesis is accepted. It means that the amount of vertical individualism is different between different age groups. Table below shows the amount of average between groups.

Table 5:Ranking of groups in Vertical individualism

	age	N	Mean Rank
Ve/ ind	21-35	74	72.12
	36-50	39	66.04
	51-65	13	77.46
	18-21	38	121.33
	Total	164	

Table 6: Test Statistics[a,b]

	Ve/ind
Chi-Square	34.090
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. Kruskal Wallis Test	
b. Grouping Variable: age	

ANOVA					
Table 7: Horizontal collectivism					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.215	3	.072	.427	.734
Within Groups	26.814	160	.168		
Total	27.029	163			

For the third hyphothesis result are swon as below:

As it show the significance level is higher than error level. thus the average of horizontal collectivism is equal between different age groups and our third hyphothesis is rejected. This means that from the horiaontal collectivism perspective Iranian culture is collectivist now like the past. Table below reveal the averages between different ages groups.

Table 8:Ranking of groups in Horizontal collectivism			
	age	N	Mean Rank
Ho/Coll	21-35	74	80.12
	36-50	39	80.88
	51-65	13	95.81
	18-21	38	84.24
	Total	164	

Table9: Test Statistics[a,b]

	Ho/Coll
Chi-Square	1.320
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.724

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: age

As we see the average between different groups are same and all the groups are collectivist.
At last for the fourth hyphothesis, the analysis of data shows that significance level is lower than error level thus the vertical collectivism between groups are different. The table of ranking and Kruskal Wallis Test are shown as below. The fourth hyphothesis is accepted.

ANOVA
Table 10: vertical collectivism

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.422	3	1.141	3.452	.018
Within Groups	52.865	160	.330		
Total	56.287	163			

Table 11: Ranking of groups in vertical collectivism

	age	N	Mean Rank
Ver/coll	21-35	74	84.14
	36-50	39	90.14
	51-65	13	98.50
	18-21	38	66.00
	Total	164	

Table12:Test Statistics[a,b]

	Ver/coll
Chi-Square	7.215
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.065

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: age

Conclution, limitation and future research suggestion
In this paper we examine the amount of individualism and collectivism between different age groups of Iranian community. We use from the questionare method for collecting data and SPSS software for analysing them. We examine the individualism and collectivism between groups through the four dimentions that Triandis has offer in 1990. These dimentions are horizontal individualism,

vertical individualism, horizontal individualism and vertical collectivism. After analysing data, we conclude that in three dimention include of horizontal individualism, vertical individualism and vertical collectivism Iranian culture is moving to individualism but in the horizontal collectivism tendency to be collectivist is high like the past. Low number of people who have participated in our survey is one of the most important limitation of our paper and we sugget to other researcher that conduct this paper in wider range of people.

References:

1. Benoît Testé (2012): Impact of an individualist vs. collectivist context on the social valorization of internal explanations, International Journal of Psychology, 47:3, 222-229

2. Deborah Cai & Edward Fink (2002): Conflict style differences between individualists and collectivists, Communication Monographs, 69:1, 67-87.

3. Valdiney V. Gouveia, Miguel Clemente & Pablo Espinosa (2003): The Horizontal and Vertical Attributes of Individualism and Collectivism in a Spanish Population, The Journal of Social Psychology, 143:1, 43-63.

4. Abbas J. Ali, Abdul Aziz Taqi & Krish Krishnan (1997): Individualism, Collectivism, and Decision Styles of Managers in Kuwait, The Journal of Social Psychology, 137:5, 629-637.

5. Nagarajan Ramamoorthy, Amit Gupta, Ron M. Sardessai & Patrick C. Flood (2005): Individualism/ collectivism and attitudes towards human resource systems: a comparative study of American, Irish and Indian MBA students, The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16:5, 852-869.

6. Bradley J. Koch & Pamela Tremain Koch, (2007), Collectivism, individualism, and outgroup cooperation in a segmented China, Asia Pacific J Manage (2007) 24:207–225.

7. Jing Zhang,(2010), The Persuasiveness of Individualistic and Collectivistic Advertising Appeals Among Chinese Generation-X Consumers, Journal of Advertising, vol. 39, no. 3 (Fall 2010), pp. 69–80.

8. Markus Kemmelmeier, Eugene Burnstein, Krum Krumov, Petia Genkova, Chie Kanagawa, Matthew S. Hirshberg, Hans-Peter, Erb, Grazyna Wieczorkowska and Kimberly A. Noels, (2003), Individualism, Collectivism, and Authoritarianism in Seven Societies, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2003 34: 304.

9. Jyoti Verma, 2001, Situational Preference for Different Types of Individualism-Collectivism, Psychology Developing Societies 2001 13: 221

10. Samani, s.and Latifiyan, M.(2005). "Analyzing the relationship of self-inhibition, collectivism & Family values among students", Journal of social & Humanity sciences of Shiraz University, No 22, V 4(Continuous No. 45).

11. Abbas Shakiba, Fateme Bahrami, Zabiholah Kave Farsani, 2011, The Study of the Factorial Structure and Psychometric Properties of the Auckland Individualism- Collectivism Scale, Knowledge & Research in Applied Psychology Autumn 2011 -Vol 12. No 3 (Continuous No. 45).

12. Alikhani, A., (2003), Looking at the phenomenon of generation gap, Tehran. Institute of humanities and social sciences of "Jahade Daneshgahi"

13. Ming-Yi Wu, Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions 30 Years Later: A Study of Taiwan and the United States, Intercultural Communication Studies XV: 1, 2006

14. Hofstede, G. (1983) "Culture's Consequences" Sage.

15. Triandis, H.C., Mc Cusker, C., & Hui. C.H. (1990). *Multimethod Probes of Individualism and Collectivism.* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,1006-1020.

16. Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

17. Triandis, H.C. (1988). Collectivism vs. individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology. In G.K. Verma & C. Bagley (Eds.), *Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes and cognition* (pp. 60–95). London: MacMillan.

18. Triandis, H.C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M.J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54,* 323–338.

19. Chua, E.G., & Gudykunst, W.B. (1987). Conflict resolution styles in low- and high-context cultures. *Communication Research Reports, 4,* 32–37.

20. Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1989). *Hd'bitos del corazdn* [Habits of the heart. Individualism and commitment in American life]. Madrid, Spain: Alianza Editorial.

21. Chan, D. K.-S. (1994). COLINDEX: A refinement of three collectivism measures. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi,

& G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism andcollectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 200-2 12). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

22. Elias, N. (1990). *La sociedad de 10s individuos* [The society of individuals]. Barcelona, Spain: Ediciones Peninsula.

23. Chen, C. C., Meindl, J. R., & Hunt, R. G. (1997). Testing the effects of vertical and hori zontal collectivism: A study of reward allocation preferences in China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28,* 44-70.

24. Gelfand, M. J., Triandis, H. C., & Chan, D. K.-S. (1996). Individualism versus collectivism or versus authoritarianism? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26,* 3974 10.

25. Gurevich, A. (1995). *The origins of European individualism.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

26. Hayek, F. A. (1948). Individualism and economic order. Chicago: University of Chicago Press."

27. Hofstede, G. (1 984). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

28. Dumont, L. (1987). *Ensayos sohre el individualism* [Essays on individualism]. Madrid, Spain: Alianza Editorial.

29. Kagitqibasi, C. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. W. Berry, M.-H. Segall, & *C.* KagitGibasi (Eds.), *Handbook* of *cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 149). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

30. Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

31. Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (1968). Los valores, 10s motivos y 10s sistemas de accidn [Values, motives, and action systems]. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Hacia una teori'a general de la accidn* [Toward a general theory of action] (pp. 67-3 I I). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Kapelusz. (Original work published 1951

32. 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,* 29, 240-275.

33. Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

34. Watt, J. (1 989). *Individualism and educational theory.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

35. Hofstede, G. (1 980). *Cultures' consequences: International differences in work-related value.* Beverly Hills: Sage

36. Hofstede, G. (1 994). The business of international business is culture. *International Business Review,* 3(1), 1-14.

37. Hui, C. *(1* 988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Research on Per sonaliy, 22.* 11-36

38. Bond, M., Leung, K., & Wan, K. (1982, June). How does cultural collectivism operate? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 13(2), 186-201

39. Inglehart, R. (1990). *Cultural shift in advanced industrial society.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

40. Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

41. Marx, K. (1973). *Foundations of the critique of political economy.* New York: Vintage Books.

5/28/2013