A critical evaluation of

# INDIVIDUALISM, COLLECTIVISM & COLLECTIVE ACTION

A Critical Evaluation of Individualism, Collectivism and Collective Action

Tuomo Rautakivi, Ritthikorn Siriprasertchok & Harri Melin

### A Critical Evaluation of Individualism, Collectivism and Collective Action





©2022 Author/s and Tampere University Press

This work is also available online at https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-359-036-6 under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

Cover design by Wille Naukkarinen, Kuuverstas

Typography and layout by Eija Kylmäniemi

ISBN 978-952-359-037-3 (print, paperback) ISBN 978-952-359-036-6 (pdf)

Published by Tampere University Press, Tampere, Finland Printed by BoD – Books on Demand, Norderstedt, Germany

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank The Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions for their support. The Finnish data was collected by the research unit of SAK. We also want to show great thanks to Mrs. Puthkalyaney for organizing the data collection in Cambodia as well as for her excellent suggestions regarding the surveys.

Last but not least, we want to express our greatest gratitude to the Royal University of Phnom Penh in Cambodia, Sebelas Maret University in Indonesia, and Tampere University in Finland for their support during our project.

Tampere 25th of January 2022 Tuomo Rautakivi, Ritthikorn Siriprasertchok and Harri Melin

### Content

1	Introduction	11
	Research questions and scope of the research	17
	Research design and theoretical framework	
	The structure of the book	
2	Th	25
2	Theoretical basis	
	Introduction	
	Theoretical basis of the study	
	The research model	66
3	Research methodology	70
J	Introduction	
	Theory building and testing	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Most Similar System Design	
	Research methods	
	Data collection	
	Data analysis	84
4	Comparison between Cambodia and Finland	86
•	Cambodia – collectivism, individualism, and collective action	
	Finland – collectivism, individualism, and collective action	
	Collectivism, individualism, and collective action	
	Most Similar System Design (MSSD) analysis	
	Dependent and environmental variables	.134
5	Conclusions	136
	The conceptual model and new knowledge	

6 Summary	148
Strategic personality traits	148
Sociocultural traits	149
Summary of the character of Cambodia as an agency	
for action	150
Summary of the characteristics of Finland as an agency	
for action	152
From agency orientation to collective action	
Collective action and agency orientation	
References	157
Appendix	175
Authors	191
m 11	
Tables	
Table 2.1: Differences in variables	52
Table 2.1: Differences in variables	
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers	54
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)	54 69
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values	54 69 79
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values  Table 3.2: Independent variables employed in the MSSD approach	54 69 79
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values  Table 3.2: Independent variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.3: Dependent variable employed in the MSSD approach	54 69 79 80
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values	54 69 79 80 81
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values  Table 3.2: Independent variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.3: Dependent variable employed in the MSSD approach	54 69 79 80 81 81
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values  Table 3.2: Independent variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.3: Dependent variable employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.4: Environmental variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.5: Landmark values and band ranges	54 69 80 81 81 85
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values  Table 3.2: Independent variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.3: Dependent variable employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.4: Environmental variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.5: Landmark values and band ranges	54 69 80 81 81 85 103
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values	54 79 80 81 85 103 111
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values  Table 3.2: Independent variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.3: Dependent variable employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.4: Environmental variables employed in the MSSD approach  Table 3.5: Landmark values and band ranges  Table 4.1: Political participation	54 79 80 81 85 103 111
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values	54 69 80 81 85 103 111 115
Table 2.2: Summary of traits and their agency bipolar enantiomers  Table 2.3: Four contrasting pairs of mindsets (Yolles and Fink, 2017)  Table 3.1: Traits and their bipolar values	546979818185103111115125

### Figures and charts

Figure 1. Cultural Agency (Adopted from Yolles and Fink 2013)	22
Figure 2. The research model arising from the theoretical	
framework adapted from Yolles and Fink (2013; 2015)	67
Figure 3. Theory building approach to research	72
Figure 4. Logic of the research process	73
Figure 5. Cultural agency with MSSD	
Chart 1: Participation in the last general election	98
Chart 2: Signed a petition	99
Chart 3: Boycotted or deliberately bought certain products for	
political, ethical, or environmental reasons	100
Chart 4: Took part in a demonstration	100
Chart 5: Attended a political meeting or rally	101
Chart 6: Contacted, or attempted to contact, a politician or	
civil servant to express own views	101
Chart 7: Donated money or raised funds for a social or	
political activity	102
Chart 8: Contacted by, or appeared in the media to	
express own views	102
Chart 9: Helped someone outside of your household	
with housework or shopping	104
Chart 10: Lent a substantial amount of money to another person	104
Chart 11: Adult children have a duty to look after their	
elderly parents	105
Chart 12: Families have a duty to look after their disabled and	
seriously ill family members	106
Chart 13: You should take care of yourself and your family first,	
before helping other people	106
Chart 14: People who are better off should help friends	
who are less well off	107
Chart 15: It is alright to develop friendships with people	
just because you know they can be of use to you?	107
Chart 16: On the whole, do you think it should be the government's	
responsibility to provide childcare for everyone who	
wants it?	108
Chart 17: Do you think it should be the government's responsibility	
to provide a decent standard of living for the elderly?	109

Chart 18: Do you think it should be the government's responsibility	
to provide healthcare for disabled and seriously ill people?	109
Chart 19: I trust other people in general	112
Chart 20: There are only few people I can trust completely	
Chart 21: Your boss or superior trusts you	
Chart 22: You trust your boss or supervisor	
Chart 23: If you are a supervisor or have subordinates,	
you trust the staff under your control?	114
Chart 24: I earn enough from work	
Chart 25: I must do another job and earn more money to survive	
Chart 26: A member of a union	
Chart 27: Your employer allows workers to join a trade union	
if they want to	118
Chart 28: Do you think there is mutual trust between unions and	
the workers of the public?	119
Chart 29: Workers need strong trade unions to protect	
their interests	119
Chart 30: Unions are important because they can increase	
the wages and salaries of employees	120
Chart 31: Unions can create stable working conditions	121
Chart 32: Without unions, wage earners' working conditions	
may worsen	121
Chart 33: Better wages	
Chart 34: I trust the union to represent my best interests for me	122
Chart 35: Legal Protection	
Chart 36: Unions can do very little or nothing to help workers	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

## The question of **individualism** versus **collectivism** is more complex than is generally believed.

This comparative study aims to develop a deeper understanding of collectivism, trade unionism, and the capacity to create collective action using Finland and Cambodia as examples of individualistic and collectivistic societies, respectively.

The authors discuss different aspects of collective action including political participation, family values, and levels of trust within the society. The theoretical framework used in the book is sociological, involving the study of social systems within which observed regularities emerge and evolve through collaborative and collective behaviour.

The results of the study show significant differences in how individuals behave at the societal level, leading to the conclusion that collective action can only occur when politically autonomous units are efficacious in the development and manifestation of their policies.



