

C

E



Center for  
Effective  
Organizations

---

**TWENTY YEARS OF *CULTURE'S  
CONSEQUENCES: A REVIEW OF THE  
EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON HOFSTEDE'S  
CULTURAL VALUE DIMENSIONS***

**CEO PUBLICATION  
T 01-12 (402)**

**BRADLEY L. KIRKMAN**  
*University of North Carolina at Greensboro*

**CRISTINA B. GIBSON**  
*Center for Effective Organizations*

**January 2001**

**TWENTY YEARS OF *CULTURE'S*  
*CONSEQUENCES: A REVIEW OF THE*  
EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON HOFSTEDE'S  
CULTURAL VALUE DIMENSIONS**

**CEO PUBLICATION  
T 01-12 (402)**

**BRADLEY L. KIRKMAN**  
*University of North Carolina at Greensboro*

**CRISTINA B. GIBSON**  
*Center for Effective Organizations*

**January 2001**

Running Head: Twenty Years of *Culture's Consequences*

Twenty Years of *Culture's Consequences*: A Review of the Empirical Research on Hofstede's  
Cultural Value Dimensions

Bradley L. Kirkman

Kevin B. Lowe

Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Cristina B. Gibson

Center for Effective Organizations  
Marshall School of Business  
University of Southern California

## Abstract

Twenty years have passed since the publication of Geert Hofstede's landmark book on international management differences, *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values* (Sage, 1980). Since the publication of Hofstede's book, researchers have utilized his framework in a variety of empirical studies. We conduct a review that includes 127 empirical studies examining Hofstede's cultural values framework published over the last 20 years. To organize our review, we used a typology that examines Hofstede-inspired research using three types of effects (i.e., culture as a direct effect, moderator, and criterion variable) at four different levels of analysis (i.e., individual, group, organization, and country). Our review demonstrated some remarkable consistencies across different types of effects and levels but also some important discrepancies. We discuss general themes that emerged from our review, recommendations for researchers who wish to use Hofstede's framework, and opportunities presented by the current gaps in Hofstede-inspired research.

## Twenty Years of *Culture's Consequences*: A Review of the Empirical Research on Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions

Twenty years have passed since the publication of Geert Hofstede's landmark book on international management differences, *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values* (Sage, 1980). Since the publication of Hofstede's book, researchers have utilized his framework in hundreds of empirical studies. Yet there has been no attempt to comprehensively review the content of the vast number of empirical studies that have been carried out using Hofstede's cultural value dimensions.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this paper is to conduct such a qualitative review using empirical studies published over the last 20 years.

First, we briefly review the four cultural values making up Hofstede's (1980a) original study summarizing his sample, methods, and findings. Second, we outline the criteria used to select the articles for this review and introduce the typology used to classify and discuss this large number of published articles. Third, the findings are reviewed using this typology. Finally, we summarize the findings and provide directions for future researchers who are interested in examining cross-cultural differences using Hofstede's cultural value dimensions in future research.

In this review, we do not provide an in-depth discussion of Hofstede's (1980a) original research, nor is our intent to critique Hofstede's theoretical foundation and statistical methodology. Overviews, critiques, and debates regarding Hofstede's work are available elsewhere (see Jaegar, 1986; Roberts & Boyacigiller, 1984; Robinson, 1983; Schwartz, 1990; 1994; Smith & Bond, 1999; and Triandis, 1982). Replications of his overall framework are also available (Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Hoppe, 1990; Punnett & Withan, 1990; Shackleton & Ali,

---

<sup>1</sup> An exception is the research note prepared by Sondergaard (1994), which provides a brief review of citations and replications of Hofstede's work.

1990; Merritt, 2000). Rather, our interest is in summarizing and synthesizing the enormous and irrefutable impact of Hofstede's cultural value framework on two decades of empirical cross-cultural research and to determine needs and directions for future empirical investigations. Though Hofstede (1980a) did not create or develop cultural values such as individualism-collectivism, his work has arguably done more to advance the understanding of cultural values among management and applied psychology scholars than anyone working in these areas to date. Trompenaars (1993, p. iii) credits Hofstede "for opening management's eyes to the importance of the [cross-cultural management] subject." Before delving into this research, we turn to a description of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions.

#### An Overview of Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions

The information Hofstede (1980a) used to develop his cultural value dimensions was derived from employee morale surveys that were administered twice at IBM (known as *Hermes* to readers of Hofstede's original work) between the years 1967 and 1969 and again between 1971 and 1973. Data collection yielded over 116,000 survey responses from over 88,000 different employees representing a total of 66 countries (subsequently reduced to 40 countries in most analyses due to the small number of responses in some of the countries). From this vast database, Hofstede selected only respondents working in the service and marketing divisions of IBM to ensure comparability across nations. The items in the questionnaire, reflecting the organization's emphasis on employee morale, measured various aspects of employees' work experiences for organizational development purposes. At the time of administration, the surveys were not intentionally designed or conceptualized to contribute theoretically to either management or psychology. Several years after the publication of his original work, Hofstede

(1983) expanded his database to include 10 additional countries and three regions (i.e., Arab countries, East Africa, and West Africa) not contained within his initial sample.

Using a factor analysis of the country-level data (i.e., individual-level survey data aggregated by country), Hofstede (1980a) found that he could classify the 40 countries along four major dimensions of national culture: individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity. Hofstede (1980b, p. 45) defined individualism as “a loosely knit social framework in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and of their immediate families only,” while collectivism “is characterized by a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups, they expect their in-group to look after them, and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute loyal to it.” He defined power distance as “the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally” (p. 45). Uncertainty avoidance was defined as “the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise” (p. 45). Finally, he defined masculinity-femininity as “the extent to which the dominant values in society are ‘masculine’ – that is, assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things, and *not* caring for others, the quality of life, or people” (p. 46).

Hofstede (1980a) gave each country a score based on averaging the items defining each dimension, and these scores were used as the basis for country rankings. Based on his analyses, Hofstede (1980a, p. 316) found a fairly strong negative correlation between the dimensions of individualism-collectivism and power distance ( $r = -.67, p < .001$ ). Rather than combining these

two factors into a single dimension, Hofstede made the decision to keep the dimensions separate based on their *a priori* conceptual independence.

In addition to the four dimensions listed above, a fifth dimension, Confucian dynamism (or Long-term versus Short-term Orientation) was identified by Michael Harris Bond, a Canadian researcher working in Hong Kong (see Chinese Culture Connection, 1987), and later developed by Hofstede and Bond (1988). The two researchers compared the IBM data to data collected using an instrument developed by Bond and his Chinese colleagues, the Chinese Value Survey (CVS). The comparison (containing data from 20 countries common to both studies) revealed that, while similar dimensions existed in both data sets for individualism-collectivism, power distance, and masculinity-femininity, there was no equivalent dimension for uncertainty avoidance in the CVS data. Thus, the long- versus short-term orientation dimension emerged as a substitute for uncertainty avoidance in Eastern cultures. Long-term orientation refers to values oriented towards the future like persistence and thrift (i.e., saving), while short-term orientation refers to values oriented towards the past and present like respect for tradition and fulfilling social obligations. Based on these investigations, subsequent research has often examined five value dimensions – individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and Confucian dynamism. We include such articles in our review, as well as those specifically examining Confucian dynamism on its own. We now turn to a discussion of the criteria we used for selecting articles to include in this review.

#### Selection Criteria for Articles Included in the Review

Our article search process was guided by a number of criteria. First, we decided to focus our attention on empirical work that has been published in journals rather than books, book chapters, conference presentations, or dissertations (with only a few exceptions). We made this



decision primarily to ensure that the research reviewed here reflects a high level of rigor characteristic of the peer review processes.

Second, we narrowed our search to journals appearing only in the management and applied psychology literatures. While Hofstede's (1980a) work has been utilized in other disciplines such as marketing (see Lynn, Zinkhan, & Harris, 1993; and Roth, 1995, for examples) and cognitive psychology (see Matsumoto, 1989, for an example), our primary interest was to comprehensively review management- and applied psychology-related uses of Hofstede's work rather than review multiple areas at a more superficial level.

Third, to further ensure a high level of rigor, we narrowed our journal selections to those that have been ranked as high quality management and psychology journals by eminent scholars, department chairs and heads, and by citation rate analyses using resources such as the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) (Extejt & Smith, 1990; Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1992; Johnson & Podsakoff, 1994; Tahai & Meyer, 1999). Example journals in management included *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Organization Science*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, and *Strategic Management Journal*. Example journals in psychology included *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, and *Psychological Bulletin*.

Fourth, to ensure that we captured a sufficient number of articles published in the international management and psychology literature, we expanded our journal search to works that specialize in international management and psychology areas (regardless of rank). Example journals here included *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *Management International Review*, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *International Journal of Psychology*, and *International Studies of Management and Organization*

and *Advances in International Comparative Management* (an annual series). The complete list of the 38 journals searched and the number of articles reviewed in each journal appears in Table 1.

Finally, our review does not include articles that failed to measure the cultural values directly or that at least included country-ranking scores from Hofstede (1980a) in empirical analyses. We found quite a few studies that purported to examine the impact of a cultural value on employee outcomes but that instead used country as categorical proxy measure. Attributions were then made claiming that a particular cultural value explained the country differences (see Chen, 1995; McGill, 1995; and Trubinsky, Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991, for examples). Such studies have been criticized in previous reviews as overly simplistic and unable to rule out other cultural value or country differences responsible for the results (Earley & Gibson, 1998). In addition, we do not include articles on such topics as masculinity and femininity when they were conceptualized as personality characteristics in the domestic psychology literature. For example, there are many studies based on Bem's (1974) Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) that assessed individual orientations on masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. Such research, while important, falls outside our review of Hofstede-inspired cross-cultural work.

We used several search techniques to find relevant articles. We conducted article title, abstract, and methodology section searches within each journal issue by issue from 1980 to the present. When the full text of articles was available on-line (usually from 1990 onward), we conducted computer-assisted searches (e.g., ABI-Inform, Ebsco Host Academic Full-Text Elite, PsycLit); otherwise, each journal was physically located and searched. As a check on our issue-by-issue search, we conducted computer-assisted key word searches within each journal using

variations of Hofstede's terms (e.g., collectivism, collectivists, collectivistic). Our search resulted in 127 articles. Next, we discuss the typology we developed for this review.

### Classification Scheme Used to Organize Our Review

Our first classification concerns the role that culture plays in the theory being tested. Research examining cultural values has examined *direct* associations between the cultural value dimensions and important outcomes (i.e., individualism-collectivism is associated with more cooperation from employees), cultural values as *moderators* of the relationship between two or more variables (i.e., group efficacy beliefs lead to higher levels of group performance in highly collectivistic groups but not in highly individualistic groups), and cultural values as *outcomes* (i.e., as one's socioeconomic status increases, one's level of collectivism decreases). Research investigations on culture as a direct effect have been labeled "Type I" studies, while studies on culture as a moderator have been labeled "Type II" (Lytle, Brett, Barsness, Tinsley, & Janssens, 1995). We note, however, that Lytle et al.'s typology omits a classification for our third set of studies, culture as a criterion variable. Thus, our first classification splits the studies into three categories: culture as a direct effect (i.e., Type I), culture as a moderating effect (i.e., Type II), and culture as a criterion variable. Our second classification concerns levels of analysis. Even though Hofstede's (1980a) research was conducted at the ecological (i.e., country) level of analysis, researchers have adopted his cultural value dimensions for work at the country, organization, group, and individual levels of analysis. Thus, our second classification is by these four levels. Table 2 depicts our 3 X 4 classification scheme with the corresponding number of articles reviewed contained within each of the 12 cells. Tables 3, 4, and 5 contain detailed article summaries on culture as direct effect, moderator, and criterion variable, respectively.

In summary, our review of the empirical work inspired by Hofstede (1980a) is comprehensive, but with certain boundary conditions. We utilized systematic criteria to limit the number of articles included, focusing specifically on highly rigorous empirical research examining the role of culture in the management, applied psychology and international management/applied psychology literatures. We now turn to our literature review.

#### Literature Review of Empirical Work Using Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions

We first review articles that have examined Hofstede's (1980a) cultural value dimensions as direct effects. Tests of direct effect models vastly outnumber those dealing with culture as a moderator or criterion variable. We discuss findings at the individual level of analysis, and then turn our attention to findings at the group, organization, and country levels. For studies investigating multiple levels of analysis, we discuss the findings for each level in the appropriate section. We further organize our review by type of criterion variable.

#### Direct Effects of Culture at the Individual Level of Analysis

This first category of studies is, by far, the largest. All five of Hofstede's (1980a) cultural value dimensions have been liberally adopted to predict individual attitudes, values, personality and behavior. This research covers three major areas that roughly correspond to the key domains of management research: organizational processes (e.g., change management; conflict management, negotiation, and reward allocations; decision making; human resource management; and leadership), individual behavior (e.g., individual behavior relating to group processes, performance, and organizational citizenship), and personality and attitudes (e.g., personality traits, work and job-related attitudes, and social values and attitudes). Some of the

articles we review here assess both direct effects and moderating effects, but focus primarily on the direct effect.<sup>2</sup> Table 3 contains more detailed articles summaries.

Organizational processes. Four studies investigated the impact of cultural values on change management (James, 1993; Geletkanycz, 1997; Anakwe, Kessler, & Christensen, 1999; Eby, Adams, Russell, & Gaby, 2000). These studies demonstrate the importance of matching the content of new technology to the cultural values of those involved in the change (James, 1993). Cultural values have also been related to receptivity to distance learning (Anakwe et al., 1999), readiness to change to team-based operations (Eby et al., 2000), and an overall reluctance to change the leadership or strategic direction of organizations (Geletkanycz, 1997).

Preferences for certain methods of processing conflict were the focus of four studies (Leung, 1987; 1988; Cocroft & Ting-Toomey, 1994; Gabrielidis & Stephan, 1997). For example, collectivists prefer bargaining and mediation more than individualists do because collectivists perceive these strategies as capable of reducing animosity between disputants (Leung, 1987). In addition, collectivists are also more likely to sue a stranger rather than a friend, whereas individualists make no such distinction when considering litigation (Leung, 1988). Collectivism was also positively related to the use of indirect face strategies in a conflict situation (Cocroft & Ting-Toomey, 1994). Finally, positive relationships have been demonstrated between masculinity and collaboration and between femininity and both collaboration and accommodation (Gabrielidis & Stephan, 1997).

---

<sup>2</sup> Regarding individualism-collectivism at the individual level of analysis specifically, some researchers have suggested the terms “idiocentrism” (corresponding to individualism at the ecological level) and “allocentrism” (corresponding to collectivism at the ecological level) as individual-level labels (Triandis, Lueng, Villareal, and Clack, 1985). Such terms would allow for a clear distinction regarding the level of analysis. Regrettably, only a few researchers have adopted these terms (Smith & Bond, 1999), and thus we retain the terms individualism and collectivism in the next section while reminding the reader that these constructs are conceptualized and assessed at the individual level of analysis (e.g., Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, & Kai-Cheng, 1997).

Negotiation preferences and behaviors were related to cultural values in four studies (Arunachalam, Wall, & Chan, 1998; Tinsley & Pillutla, 1998; Brett and Okumura, 1998; Pearson & Stephan, 1998). In these studies, collectivism was related to higher joint outcomes, but mediation had a stronger effect in individualistic rather than collectivistic cultures (Arunachalam et al., 1998). Individualists viewed self-interest and joint problem solving in negotiation as more appropriate than collectivists did; and collectivists viewed equality norms as more appropriate than individualists did (Tinsley & Pillutla, 1998). Power distance was related to the endorsement of distributive tactics (Brett & Okamura, 1998). The findings of this latter study also revealed that in *inter*-cultural negotiations, there was a significantly higher lack of understanding of the priorities of the other party and the utility of a compatible issue compared to *intra*-cultural negotiations. Similar to the findings for conflict management, collectivism was related to preferences for accommodation, collaboration, and withdrawal in negotiations; and individualism was related to a preference for competition and high concern for self (Pearson & Stephan, 1998). Finally, collectivists made accommodations and avoided conflict more when the conflict was with an ingroup member (e.g., friend or family), rather than an outgroup member (e.g., stranger or coworker), while individualists treated ingroup and outgroup members similarly (Pearson & Stephan, 1998).

In an area that has proven to be a fruitful application of Hofstede's (1980a) cultural values, nine studies examined the impact of national culture on reward allocation preferences (Mann, Radford, & Kanagawa, 1985; Leung and Iwawaki, 1988; Hui, Triandis, & Yee, 1991; Tower, Kelly, & Richards, 1997; Chen, Meindl, & Hunt, 1997; Chen, Meindl, & Hui, 1998; McClean-Parks, Conlon, Ang, & Bontempo, 1999; Brockner, Chen, Mannix, Leung, & Skarlicki, 2000; Gomez, Kirkman, & Shapiro, in press). In these studies, collectivists put a greater

emphasis on an equal allocation of rewards, were more generous with rewards, and treated close friends more generously than coworkers; however, individualists made no such distinctions (Hui et al., 1999) and tended to be more self-interested (Mann et al., 1985).

Chen et al. (1997) found that vertical collectivism<sup>3</sup> was positively related to reward allocation reform and equalitarian allocation preferences in the People's Republic of China (PRC). Horizontal collectivism<sup>4</sup> was negatively related to reward allocation reform and differential allocation preferences. There were also several interesting interaction effects between vertical and horizontal collectivism. Chen et al. (1998) found additional interactions between collectivism and task interdependence. For example, in highly interdependent task situations, achievement motivation is positively related to differential reward allocations for both collectivists and individualists; however, for less interdependent tasks, achievement motivation is *negatively* related to differential rewards for collectivists but *positively* related for individualists.

Other researchers have demonstrated that individualists take longer to *recover* resources than collectivists do, while the opposite is true for resource *allocation* (McLean-Parks et al., 1999). Individualism-collectivism also influenced participants' view of outcome favorability (Brockner et al., 1999). For individualists, under conditions of high procedural fairness, outcome favorability was more strongly related to objections to a decision when compared to collectivists. On the other hand, for collectivists (but less so for individualists), procedural fairness reduced the positive relationship between outcome favorability and desire for future business with a partner in a negotiation. Finally, Gomez et al. (in press) showed that collectivists gave more generous evaluations to ingroup (rather than outgroup) members. In addition, individualists

---

<sup>3</sup> Vertical collectivism conceptualizes an individual's view of the self as an aspect of the group, members of an ingroup are seen to be *different* from the self, and *inequality* is accepted.

<sup>4</sup> Horizontal collectivism conceptualizes an individual's view the self as an aspect of the group, members of an ingroup are seen as *similar* to the self, and *equality* is valued.

valued task inputs (i.e., a person's contributions to task accomplishment such as quality of work) in determining evaluations more so than did collectivists.

Three studies examined the impact of culture on decision-making with two studies related specifically to risk (Ali, 1993; Nootboom, Berger, & Noorderhaven, 1997) and one focused on new venture creation (Mitchell, Smith, Seawright, & Morse, in press). Ali (1993) found that individualism was positively related to consultative, participative, and autocratic decision-making styles and to attitudes toward risk. Nootboom et al. (1997) found that uncertainty avoidance was negatively related to the perceived probability of a potential loss by transaction partners but unrelated to the actual size of loss. Mitchell et al. (in press) found that individualism and power distance were positively related to "ability" scripts (i.e., given the resources, the person will be able to carry out the main goal of a script); individualism was positively related to "willingness" scripts (i.e., given the resources, the person will want to carry out the main goal of a script); and that individualism moderated the relationship between "arrangements" scripts (i.e., does the person have access to the required materials?) and the venture creation decision such that a stronger relationship existed for individualists compared to collectivists.

Five studies examined the role of national culture in human resources management practices and effects (Ozawa, Crosby, & Crosby, 1996; Cable & Judge, 1994; Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998; Earley, 1986; Earley, Gibson, & Chen, 1999). These studies examined the relationship between collectivism and affirmative action programs (individualists viewed them less favorably) (Ozawa et al., 1996), preferences for individual-based pay (the relationship was negative) (Cable & Judge, 1994), and evaluations of selection procedures (Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998). The latter study found that collectivism was negatively related to the use of



selection tests, formal appraisal practices, and desire for promotions based on merit, and positively related to preference for equality-based rewards and employment security.

Earley and his colleagues (1986; Earley et al., 1999) examined the impact of cultural values on feedback in performance appraisals. Both collectivism and power distance interacted with feedback type such that for individualists and those low in power distance, performance increased after positive and negative feedback; whereas for collectivists and those high in power distance, only positive feedback resulted in performance increases. Further, the perceived importance of feedback received and trust in supervisor partially mediated the direct effects of praise, criticism, and culture on performance. Earley et al. (1999) found that collectivism was positively related to individual-based performance beliefs and satisfaction, and that collectivists had their highest efficacy in the combination of high group and high individual performance information. The results suggested that individual feedback plays a role for both individualists and collectivists, whereas group feedback appeared to be critical only for collectivists.

The relationship leadership preferences and evaluations and cultural values was the focus of three studies (Casimir & Keats, 1996; Pillai & Meindl, 1998; Helgstrand & Stuhlmacher, 1999). Results indicated that certain leadership behaviors and styles are more universally appropriate, whereas others are preferred based on cultural values. For example, regardless of culture, respondents seem to prefer a leader who expresses a high concern for both performance and group relations (Casimir & Keats, 1996). In the same study, and specifically in low-stress environments, collectivists preferred a leader who only showed concern for group relations. When respondents were asked to rank preferred leadership styles, individualists were more likely to rank first the leader who shows high concern for both performance and group relations than were collectivists.

Collectivism was also positively related to the level of charismatic leadership, which in turn was positively related to supervisory ratings of work unit performance, job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, and leader effectiveness (Pillai & Meindl, 1998). Finally, contrary to the prediction that leader preferences would match national cultural value differences, respondents in both high and low power distance countries (e.g., the U.S. and Denmark, respectively) rated leaders who were both feminine and individualistic as most effective (Helgstrand & Stuhlmacher, 1999).

Individual Behavior. Like the reward allocation studies, individual behavior in group and team settings has received a substantial amount of cross-cultural attention. Individualism has been positively associated with more concern for one's own goals than one's ingroup goals, less attention to the views of ingroups, self-reliance with competition, detachment from ingroups, deciding on one's own rather than asking for the views of others, and less general concern for ingroups (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). Surprisingly, in the same study, collectivism was not associated with conventional attitudes towards groups (i.e., conforming more, seeing oneself as always under the influence of ingroups, showing more concern for ingroup members, and subordinating individual needs to the needs of ingroups). In fact, none of these attitudes emerged in Triandis et al.'s Japanese or Puerto Rican (i.e., collectivistic) samples. Triandis et al. did find, however, that collectivism correlated positively with social support and negatively with loneliness and with the view that competition occurs more between ingroups and outgroups, rather than within ingroups.

Oyserman (1993) found that individualism was positively related to focusing on private aspects of the self (i.e., one's goals, intentions, plans, thoughts, and feelings that are not accessible by others) and conceptualizing the self in terms of distinctions between the self and

others. Collectivism was positively related to centrality of social identities to self-definition (i.e., the salience of one's religious or national identity), a focus on public aspects of the self, and a heightened perception of intergroup conflict. Interestingly, individualism was also positively related to these variables.

Collectivism has also been positively associated with self-efficacy for teamwork, need for social approval, and positive past experience working in teams (Eby & Dobbins, 1997).

Collectivists also have reported higher levels of social obligation and obligation to ingroups when cultural identity was salient (Oyserman, Sakamoto, & Lauffer, 1998). Collectivism was positively related to participants' positive assessments of group processes; and participant cultural distance on collectivism (i.e., the degree of difference between individuals and other group members on collectivism) was negatively related to group receptiveness (Thomas, 1999)

Finally, cultural values have been associated with self-managing work team (SMWT) effectiveness (Kirkman & Shapiro, 1997). Collectivism was positively related to receptivity to team-based rewards (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2000a) and to team members' job satisfaction and organizational commitment in SMWTs (Kirkman & Shapiro, in press). In the latter study, employee resistance to teams mediated the relationships between collectivism and both satisfaction and commitment while employee resistance to self-management partially mediated the negative relationship between power distance and organizational commitment.

Two studies examined the impact of national culture on employee propensity to perform organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Collectivism was positively related to several dimensions of OCB after controlling for the effects of procedural justice (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). In a second study, however, organization-based self-esteem fully mediated this relationship (Van Dyne, Vandewalle, Kostova, Latham, & Cummings, 2000).

Personality and cultural values were examined in five studies (Hui & Villareal, 1989; Oyserman, 1993; Yamaguchi & Kuhlman, 1995; Wojciszke, 1997; Grimm, Church, Katigbak, & Reyes, 1999). In Hong Kong, collectivism was negatively related to preference for autonomy, deference, and need for heterosexuality; and positively related to preferences for affiliation, succorance, and nurturance (Hui & Villareal, 1989). In the U.S., collectivism was positively related to autonomy, affiliation, succorance, and nurturance; and individualism was also positively related to a high need for social recognition and a low need for abasement (Hui & Villareal, 1989). Both individualism and collectivism were positively related to Machiavellianism (Oyserman, 1993). Collectivism has also been shown to be positively related to affiliative tendency and sensitivity to rejection and negatively related to need for uniqueness (Yamaguchi & Kuhlman, 1995). Individualistic values have also been more strongly related to ratings of competence compared to ratings of morality and were more strongly related to ratings of self-profitability than other-profitability (an opposite pattern emerged for collectivistic values) (Wojciszke, 1997). In the U.S., individualism has been negatively correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, civility, and refinement; and in the Philippines, individualism has been negatively correlated with gregariousness (Grimm et al., 1999). Finally, collectivism was positively related to the self-liking dimension of self-esteem but negatively related to the self-competence dimension of self-esteem (Tafarodi, Lang, & Smith, 1999).

The impact of national culture on work-related attitudes and behavior was examined in three studies (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994; Bennett, 1999; Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). Collectivists reported having more informal contact with fellow workers, knew staff better, and were more likely to work on a team rather than alone compared to individualists. Respondents high in power distance were less open with their superiors, had more contact with them,

described their supervision as being more close and direct, were more task-oriented, and had greater beliefs in Theory X (i.e., directive, top-down, formal) management compared to those low in power distance (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994). Collectivism was also positively related to favorable attitudes towards group activities and cooperation. In the U.S., masculinity was negatively related to positive attitudes towards human development (Bennett, 1999). Finally, in a study of cultural values and organizational commitment, collectivism was positively related to affective (i.e., value-based) commitment to supervisors and work groups, continuance (i.e., based on high costs of leaving) commitment to work groups, and normative (i.e., based on one's social obligation) commitment to all foci (i.e., organizations, supervisors, and work groups); power distance was positively related to affective commitment to organizations and both continuance and normative commitment to all foci; and uncertainty avoidance was positively related to affective commitment to organizations and continuance commitment to all foci. There were no significant relationships between masculinity and organizational commitment (Clugston et al., 2000).

While social attitudes and values do not match our criteria for management or applied psychological applications of Hofstede's (1980a) cultural values, we include brief references here to nine studies whose findings are nonetheless pertinent to workplace values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. In a variety of studies on social attitudes and values, individualism-collectivism was linked to: types of personal motivation among youth (Phalet & Claeys, 1993); Asian American perceptions of stereotypes of their own cultural group (Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997); social behaviors of Turkish citizens (Goregenli, 1997); Islamic work beliefs of Arabs working in Israel (Abu-Saad, 1998); emotional expression differences in Japan and the U.S. (Stephan, Stephan, Saito, & Barnett, 1998); intimate disclosure in former communist countries

(Goodwin, Nizharadze, Luu, Kosa, & Emelyanova, 1999); attitudes toward physician-assisted suicide in the U.S. (Kimmelmeier, Burnstein, & Peng, 1999); and the tendency for people to use their current life satisfaction to predict current events (Oishi, Wyer, & Colcombe, 2000).

Masculinity-femininity was linked to gender stereotypes and romantic partner preferences among women from a variety of Asian countries (Hofstede, 1996a).

In summary, the almost 60 studies that investigated direct effects demonstrated the wide applicability of Hofstede's (1980a) framework at the individual level of analysis. Cultural values affected how individuals reacted to change, handled conflict, conducted negotiations, allocated rewards, made decisions, and behaved in group and team settings. Cultural values also influenced individuals' pay preferences; use of selection tests and systems; reactions to different types of feedback; leadership preferences and styles; propensity to perform organizational citizenship behavior; personality traits; work-related attitudes such as organizational commitment, teamwork, and supervisory evaluations; and societal level attitudes and values such as stereotypes and intimate disclosure. All of these outcomes are important to overall organizational effectiveness and to scholars of management and applied psychology. While Hofstede's specific measures of the cultural values were not used in these studies (i.e., they were designed only for the country level of analysis), individual-level analogs of his measures have supported the impact of his overall framework at the micro level of organizational behavior. We now turn to the direct effects of cultural values at the group level of analysis.

#### Direct Effects of Culture at the Group Level of Analysis

Relative to work at the individual level of analysis, attention to the direct effects of cultural values at the group level remains relatively sparse and mostly recent. We found only six studies that examined direct effects of culture at the group level (Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991;

Eby & Dobbins, 1997; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2000b; Oetzel, 1998; Pillai & Meindl, 1998; Elron, 1997). Four of the six studies included cooperation as an outcome or process variable. For example, ethnically diverse groups (i.e., those high, on average, in collectivism) behaved more cooperatively than all-Anglo groups (i.e., those low, on average, in collectivism); and these differences tended to increase when situational cues favored cooperation (Cox et al., 1991). Similarly, team collectivistic orientation was directly positively related to team cooperation, which in turn mediated the relationship between team collectivistic orientation and team performance. However, in another study, resistance to teams was found to mediate the relationship that collectivism had with cooperation (and also team empowerment and productivity) (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2000b). Finally, individualistic groups had a greater number of conflicts, fewer co-operating tactics, and more competing tactics than collectivistic groups (Oetzel, 1998).

The two other studies that examined group level effects of cultural values investigated leadership processes. Work group collectivism was positively related to the emergence of charismatic leadership in intact work groups (Pillai & Meindl, 1998). In addition, top management team (TMT) cultural heterogeneity (i.e., an index created using Hofstede's, 1980a, country scores) was positively related to TMT performance, issue-based conflict, and overall subsidiary performance; however, issue-based conflict was negatively related to TMT performance (Elron, 1997). More specifically, increasing heterogeneity on both individualism-collectivism and masculinity-femininity was positively related to TMT performance; and increasing heterogeneity on uncertainty avoidance was positively related to issue-based conflict.

In summary, the lack of attention to the effects of cultural values at the group- or team-level of analysis is readily apparent. Of the five cultural values, individualism-collectivism

appears to be the most likely choice of predictor variable because of its close theoretical tie to group behavior and functioning (Hofstede, 1980a). Indeed, the links between individualism-collectivism and group processes such as cooperation and conflict were supported in several studies. However, theoretical ties can be drawn between the other cultural values and team processes and performance. Both Kirkman and Shapiro (1997) and Pillai and Meindl (1998) argue that power distance should be negatively related to the willingness of a team's members to take autonomous action normally required in SMWTs. Similarly, the emphasis that masculine cultural values place on achievement, assertiveness, and not caring for others, the quality of life, or people could have an impact on a team's willingness to work together or be cohesive (Hofstede, 1998). Clearly, our review shows that more work needs to be done on the direct effects of all of Hofstede's cultural values at the group and team levels of analysis.

#### Direct Effects of Culture at the Organization Level of Analysis

Similar to the lack of attention at the group level, we were only able to find four studies that have examined the direct impact of culture on organizations (Morris, Davis, and Allen, 1993; Morris, Avila, & Allen, 1994; Newman & Nollen, 1996; Steensma, Marino, Weaver, & Dickson, in press). For example, individualism-collectivism had a curvilinear relationship with entrepreneurial behavior such that at high levels of individualism or collectivism, firm-level entrepreneurial behavior suffered (Morris et al., 1993; 1994). The highest levels of entrepreneurial behavior occurred when firms had a relative balance on individualism-collectivism. When managers fitted their organizational practices to the values of the country's culture in which they operated, their work units had higher returns on assets, higher return on sales, and in some cases higher bonuses than work units in which a fit was lacking (Newman & Nollen, 1996). Finally, firms in more masculine cultures are less likely to pursue technology



alliances than are firms in more feminine cultures; and firms in more individualistic cultures were less likely to pursue equity ties in their alliance formation than firms in more collectivistic cultures (Steensma et al., in press).

In summary, aggregating cultural values to the organization level of analysis provided significant findings in several important areas for organizations. Perhaps the most surprising finding was that individualism-collectivism had a curvilinear relationship with entrepreneurial behavior across firms (Morris et al., 1993; 1994). Previous researchers have used strong individualism to help explain the high level of breakthrough innovations and entrepreneurial behavior in the U.S. (McClelland, 1967; Spence, 1985). Perhaps the findings of Morris and his colleagues show that some level of collaborative values are needed to be successful in entrepreneurship. The findings regarding the fit of national culture with management practices (Newman & Nollen, 1996) show that, literally, *being culturally sensitive pays* (i.e., work units with high fit had higher returns on assets, sales, and higher bonuses than work units with low fit). Next, we discuss findings regarding the direct effect of culture at the country level of analysis.

#### Direct Effects of Culture at the Country Level of Analysis

Two general sets of studies emerged in our review of the direct effects of culture at the country level of analysis. The first set of studies can be classified as research that examines the impact of *cultural distance* on various organizational and country-level outcomes. Almost all of the studies use a composite index of cultural distance first created by Kogut and Singh (1988). Their index is based on the deviation along each of Hofstede's original four cultural value dimensions from the score of a given focal (i.e., home) country for each country. The deviations are corrected for differences in the variance of each dimension and then arithmetically averaged. One exception is Barkema, Bell, and Pennings (1996) who, in addition to using Kogut and

Singh's measure, also included both interval and ordinal distance measures based on Ronen and Shenkar's (1985) country classification.

Cultural distance studies. General findings from this set of studies shows that as the cultural distance between countries increased, the tendency to choose a joint venture over an acquisition (i.e., have less direct investment) increased (Kogut & Singh, 1988); the amount of U.S. foreign direct investment (FDI) decreased (although this relationship is not significant in later time periods due to what the authors' call an acculturation process) (Li & Guisinger, 1992; Loree & Guisinger, 1995); shareholder wealth in those firms making cross-border acquisitions decreased as a result of the acquisition (Datta & Puia, 1995); a greater proportion of incentive-based compensation was used for subsidiary managers of host-country foreign affiliates (Roth & O'Donnell, 1996); equity joint venture partners were more likely to acquire an equal or majority share, rather than a minority share (Pan, 1996); foreign venture longevity decreased (Barkema et al., 1996), especially when joint ventures (Barkema, Shenkar, Vermeulen, & Bell, 1997) or acquisitions were considered; greater structural changes in alliance and contracts took place (Kashlak, Chandran, & Di Benedetto, 1998); shared-equity ventures were preferred over wholly-owned subsidiaries (Hennart & Larimo, 1998); and international expansion performance decreased (Luo & Peng, 1999).

Interestingly, and in contrast to the studies above, other studies found that cultural distance did not affect initial or subsequent FDI location decisions (Benito & Gripsrud, 1992; Terpstra & Yu, 1988), the type of cooperative arrangements firms across borders preferred (Pan & Tse, 1996), the choice between acquisitions and green-field sites (Brouthers & Brouthers, 2000), or firm performance (Gomez-Mejia & Palich, 1997). On the positive side, larger cultural distances were related to lower joint venture dissolution rates (Park & Ungson, 1997) and better

performance of cross-border acquisitions (Morosini, Shane, & Singh, 1998). These conflicting findings may be explained, in part, by studies that examined “distance” on *each of the cultural values separately*.

For example, cultural distance on both individualism-collectivism and uncertainty avoidance were negatively related to CEO role ambiguity (Shenkar & Zeira, 1992); and uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation (and to a lesser extent masculinity) had negative effects on the survival of international joint ventures (Barkema & Vermeulen, 1997). In the latter study, the authors found the effects of cultural distance had not decreased over time.

Five studies examined the direct impact of country scores on Hofstede's (1980a) cultural value dimensions while *controlling* for cultural distance (Shane 1992; 1994; Erramilli, 1996; Kogut & Singh, 1988; Brouthers & Brouthers, 2000). In high power distance countries (i.e., where trust is low), firms preferred FDI over licensing (Shane, 1992; 1994) and sought majority ownership in foreign subsidiaries (Erramilli, 1996). Uncertainty avoidance was also positively linked to majority ownership in foreign subsidiaries (Erramilli, 1996), the tendency to use joint ventures or greenfields over acquisitions (Kogut & Singh, 1988), and a preference for greenfield start-up ventures rather than acquisitions (Brouthers & Brouthers, 2000). We now turn to a discussion of studies that examined the direct impact of national culture (without using cultural distance) on organizational and country-level outcomes.

Other country level studies. Apart from studies examining cultural distance, other work has linked cultural value scores by country to a variety of outcomes. For example, using archival data, Confucian dynamism was a strong predictor of economic growth (for the time periods 1965-1980 and 1980-1987) while individualism was negatively linked to growth (but only for the first time period) (Franke, Hofstede, & Bond, 1991). Similar to the individual level of

analysis, cultural values have also been linked to conflict handling styles (Smith, Dugan, Peterson, & Leung, 1998; Morris et al., 1998), managerial reactions to a crisis (Schneider & De Meyer, 1991), human resource practice preferences (Schuler & Rogovsky, 1998; Ryan, McFarland, Baron, & Page, 1999), and leadership practices and behaviors (Offerman & Hellmann, 1997; House et al., 1999) at the country level. Cultural values also played a role in innovation championing strategies (Shane, Venkataraman, & MacMillan, 1995; Shane, 1995), information seeking in networks (Zaheer & Zaheer, 1997), national accounting practices (Salter & Niswander, 1995), the level of systematic risk in stock exchanges (Riahi-Belkaoui, 1998), and national corruption levels (Husted, 1999). Finally, studies have shown that individualism was strongly positively correlated with wealth at the national level, negatively correlated with cultural heterogeneity (Diener & Diener, 1995), and positively related to the subjective well being of nations (Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995).

An interesting set of exchanges regarding the impact of national culture on role conflict, ambiguity, and overload took place in *The Academy of Management Journal* (Peterson et al., 1995; Van de Vliert & Van Yperen, 1996; Peterson & Smith, 1997). First, it was shown that high power distance and low individualism were positively related to high levels of role overload and low levels of role ambiguity (Peterson et al., 1995). In a later article, it was shown that the average daytime temperature for a country's capital, and not power distance, was positively related to role overload (Van de Vliert & Van Yperen, 1996). In a reply to Van de Vliert and Van Yperen (1996), Peterson and Smith (1997) added 11 new countries to their data set and replaced the capital city temperature score with the temperature from the cities in which their data collection actually took place. Results showed that power distance was the stronger

predictor of role overload than ambient temperature, and that the findings also extended to role ambiguity.

In summary, the country level findings for cultural value differences reinforce Hofstede's (1980a) original contention that values directly affect the aggregate management practices and beliefs of entire nations. Based on their cultural values, employees in different countries argue and disagree using different styles, prefer to be paid differently, use different hiring and selection methods and systems, carry out innovative championing strategies in different ways, and prefer to lead and be led differently. Additional findings showed that cultural values could be tied to levels of national wealth (similar to Hofstede's, 1980a, findings), corruption, subjective well being, national accounting practices and standards, role overload and ambiguity, information seeking in networks, and systematic risk in stock exchanges. Admittedly, there are countless other variables influencing these outcomes at the country level as well. However, such consistent findings for Hofstede's cultural values across a wide variety of different country-level outcomes underscore the pervasive effects that cultural values have on business practices and systems. The next section of our review examines studies that included culture as a moderator. We first review studies at the individual (and dyad) level of analysis followed by studies at the group, organization, and country levels.

#### Moderating Effects of Culture at the Individual Level of Analysis

Similar to the large number of articles dealing with the direct effects of culture at the individual level of analysis, we found many articles that investigated the moderating effect of culture on individual-level relationships. Table 4 contains more detailed article summaries. These 13 articles can also be grouped into two categories: organizational processes and individual behavior.

Organizational processes. Four studies examined the moderating effect of cultural values on motivation (Erez & Earley, 1987; Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Earley, 1994; Eylon & Au, 1999). These studies showed that cultural values were important contingency factors affecting the relationships between: goal setting strategies and individual performance (Erez & Earley, 1987), leader behavior and both subordinate performance and satisfaction (Dorfman & Howell, 1988), both individual- and group-focused training and self-efficacy (Earley, 1994), and empowerment and both job satisfaction and performance (Eylon & Au, 1999).

Two studies that examined the impact of power distance on relationships involving people's perceptions of procedural justice generated conflicting findings. In one study, power distance had no moderating effect on the relationship between a person's opportunity to voice concerns about a decision and perceptions of procedural justice (Lind, Tyler, & Huo, 1997). In contrast, a four-study article demonstrated that participants were more likely to respond unfavorably (i.e., with lower levels of organizational commitment) to low levels of voice when they were from low, rather than high, power distance cultures (Brockner et al., in press).

Finally, in a study on leadership processes, collectivists generated more ideas working with a transformational leader rather than a transactional leader, while individualists generated more ideas with a transactional leader when compared to a transformational leader (Jung & Avolio, 1999).

Individual behavior. Four studies addressed the impact of culture on the relationships of individuals working in groups and, similar to the direct effects studies, most of these studies looked exclusively at the impact of individualism-collectivism (Earley, 1989; 1993; Wagner, 1995; Chen, Brockner, & Katz, 1998). These studies showed that the performance of collectivists, but not individualists, was significantly improved when there was shared

responsibility (Earley, 1989) and an ingroup context (Earley, 1993). Also, the relationships between both group size and individuals' identifiability and cooperation in groups were stronger for individualists than collectivists (Wagner, 1995).

Regarding individuals' behavior in intergroup situations, in high accountability negotiations, the more collectivist the dyad, the higher the level of: willingness to concede, cooperative behavior, profit from the negotiation, and positive impression of the opponent (the opposite held for low accountability negotiations) (Gelfand & Realo, 1999). Finally, in a study examining vertical individualism and collectivism, vertical individualists were least cooperative in a single-group dilemma but were more cooperative in an intergroup dilemma; whereas vertical collectivists were most cooperative in the single-group dilemma but were less cooperative in the intergroup dilemma (Probst, Carnevale, & Triandis, 1999).

In summary, as has been seen in other sections, individualism-collectivism continued to have strong effects on the behavior of individuals working in groups or teams. Whether the studies examined *within*-group or *between*-group behavior, collectivists were more likely to cooperate, in general, than were individualists (Probst et al., 1999; Wagner, 1995), especially when accountability was high (Gelfand & Realo, 1999). However, reinforcing the notion that collectivists place a higher value on ingroup, rather than outgroup well-being (Triandis et al., 1988), several studies demonstrated that the performance of collectivists was affected by ingroup-outgroup status more so than the performance of individualists (Chen et al., 1998; Earley, 1993). We now turn to studies examining the moderating effects of the cultural values at the group level of analysis.

### Moderating Effects of Culture at the Group Level of Analysis

Similar to the lack of research examining direct effects at the group level, we found only four studies exploring the moderating effects of culture in groups (Palich, Hom, & Griffeth, 1995; Erez & Somech, 1996; Gibson, 1999; Earley, 1999). These studies demonstrated that goal characteristics differentially affected group performance depending on whether the groups were composed of individualists or collectivists (Erez & Somech, 1996). Regarding efficacy in groups, group efficacy and group performance were positively related when collectivism was high, but not when it was low (Gibson, 1999); and in high power distance cultures, collective judgments of group efficacy were more strongly tied to higher-, rather than lower-, status group members' personal judgments (Earley, 1999). In contrast, in low power distance cultures, group members contributed comparably to group efficacy judgments. Surprisingly, none of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions moderated the relationships between typical U.S.-based predictors of organizational commitment (e.g., job scope, participative management, extrinsic rewards, and role clarity) and commitment in a large number of foreign affiliates (Palich, Hom, & Griffeth, 1995).

In summary, compared to the group level studies of direct effects of culture, a greater variety of the cultural values were utilized in the moderating effect studies. Such findings should encourage researchers to examine both the direct and moderating effects of all of the cultural value dimensions. Perhaps, however, as the Palich et al. (1995) study demonstrated, moderating effects are harder to find given the overall statistical difficulties associated with detecting moderators (McClelland & Judd, 1993). Researchers interested in testing rigorous theoretical development regardless of whether empirical tests will be difficult to undertake should strive to overcome such a challenge. The moderating effect of culture at the group level of analysis is a



fruitful area of future research that has yet to be tapped. We now turn to moderating effects at the organization level.

#### Moderating Effects of Culture at the Organization Level of Analysis

We found four studies that examined the moderating effect of culture at the organization level of analysis (Chatman & Barsade, 1995; Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neale, 1998; Dickson & Weaver, 1997; Steensma et al., in press). In a series of experiments, collectivistic versus individualistic organizational culture was a strong moderator of the relationships between individuals' cultural values and their behavior within those cultures (Chatman & Barsade, 1995; Chatman et al., 1998). Regarding alliance use, the increase in the odds of using alliances as a result of perceived general uncertainty was greatest for collectivistic managers rather than for individualistic managers; and the negative effect that perceived potential for future growth and profits in a firm's industry had on alliance use was stronger for collectivists compared to individualists (Dickson & Weaver, 1997). Finally, the relationship between perceived technological uncertainty and use of technological alliances was stronger for firms in high, rather than low, uncertainty avoidance countries and for firms in less, rather than more, masculine countries (Steensma et al., in press).

Though the studies of this type are small in number, the results clearly show that culture at the organizational level can have important effects on the relationships between other important variables in organizations. The work of Chatman and her colleagues (Chatman & Barsade, 1995; Chatman et al., 1998) demonstrated that individualistic and collectivistic organizational cultures exert dramatic influences on employee behavior, and that collectivistic organizational cultures may be best suited for highly diverse employee populations. Within a single country (i.e., Norway), uncertainty was more likely to lead to alliance use in firms with

collectivistic, rather than individualistic, top managers (Dickson & Weaver, 1997). Similarly, the tendency to use technological alliances in the face of perceived technological uncertainty was affected by both uncertainty avoidance and masculinity-femininity (Steensma et al., in press). Next, we discuss the moderating effects of the cultural values at the country level of analysis.

#### Moderating Effects of Culture at the Country Level of Analysis

The moderating impact of cultural values at the country level of analysis was examined in two studies. The relationship between both friendship satisfaction and satisfaction with the self and life satisfaction and was stronger in individualistic nations when compared to collectivistic nations (Diener & Diener, 1995). In a meta-analysis, the relationship between job level and job satisfaction was weaker in studies conducted in low power distance countries when compared to studies conducted in high power distance countries (Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra, & Smith, 1998). We now turn to a discussion of studies examining national culture as a criterion variable.

#### Culture as a Criterion Variable

Four studies examined factors contributing to the development of cultural values. Table 5 contains more detailed article summaries. Three studies examined the influence of demography at the individual level of analysis on respondents' level of individualism-collectivism. First, Gaines et al. (1997) found that Anglos scored lower on collectivism than people of color (but the two groups did not differ on individualism). The effects were stronger, however, when a mediator (race/ethnic identity) was added to the equation. That is, people of color scored higher on race/ethnic identity, which in turn was positively related to collectivism. Second, collectivism was also negatively related to socio-economic status, fluency in English, occupational status, and age (Freeman, 1997). Individualism was also positively related to urban residence and (opposite to prediction) negatively related to educational status and occupational

status. The authors pointed out that these data echo Hofstede's (1980a) ecological findings regarding the link between individualism and per capita gross national product (GNP). Finally, Marshall (1997) found that social class was a stronger predictor of individualism than nationality was.

At the country level, Vandello and Cohen (1999) examined patterns of individualism-collectivism by state within the United States. Indexes of collectivism were constructed by state using various indicators from publicly available data. Grouping states together into regions made it possible to test hypotheses regarding the level of collectivism in various parts of the U.S. Consistent with their predictions, the authors found that Hawaii and the states in the Deep South were the most collectivistic while states in the Mountain West and Great Plains were the least collectivistic. In a second part of their study, the authors validated their state-level rankings at the individual level of analysis by successfully correlating their index scores on cultural values with attitudinal responses on the National Election Survey (NES) from 1990. Their collectivism index was also positively correlated with poverty levels; population density (as measured both by persons per square mile and metro area population as a percentage of total population); historically labor-intensive, plantation style farming (as opposed to self-run, herding-type farming); percentage of minorities in the state; and historical percentage of slaves per state. The collectivism index was also negatively correlated with suicide rates, binge drinking, gender equality, and racial equality.

This set of articles demonstrated that demographic variables were related to respondent scores on individualism-collectivism at the individual level of analysis. Factors such as race-ethnicity, age, socio-economic status, education, and occupation may play important roles in the

development of individualism-collectivism, even within nations that appear to be highly individualistic or highly collectivistic.

In summary, we have discussed the empirical research that has examined Hofstede's (1980a) cultural values at four levels of analysis (i.e., individual, group, organizational, and country) and three types of effects (i.e., direct, moderating, and criterion). Using this typology, we have been able to show that cultural values have an intense and pervasive effect on attitudes and behavior at multiple levels of analysis. We discuss overall themes across our typology in our discussion and directions for future research sections, next.

#### What Has Been Learned and Where Do We Go From Here?

In addition to the category-specific issues we identified above in conjunction with each category in our typology, several important general themes and issues can be delineated by examining the implications of Hofstede-inspired research from a much broader perspective. We discuss general themes that emerged from our review, recommendations for researchers who wish to use Hofstede's (1980a) framework in subsequent investigations, and gaps in Hofstede-inspired research that represent potential opportunities for future researchers.

#### Themes Emerging from the Review and Implications for Research

Reviewing the body of research that was inspired by Hofstede's (1980a) framework, at least three general statements can be made. First, cultural values have pervasive direct and moderating effects at each of the four levels of analysis for a variety of different criterion variables. Second, the specific level of analysis being investigated does impact the type of findings that are obtained in these studies. Finally, causal relationships are seldom demonstrated by this domain of research, and thus casual claims should be interpreted with extreme caution.

Cultural values have direct and moderating effects. A strong theme emerging from our review is that cultural values directly and indirectly influence the attitudes and behaviors of individuals, groups, organizations, and countries. Clearly, Hofstede's (1980a) cultural value framework is alive and well in the management, psychology, and international management/psychology literatures. Empirical studies at all levels of analysis demonstrated that achieving a "fit" between the dominant cultural values exhibited by employees and specific management practices and initiatives is important.

For example, at the individual level of analysis, employees high in collectivism were more accepting of the teamwork aspect of self-managing work teams and, in turn, were more satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organizations (Kirkman & Shapiro, in press). At the group level, collectivism was positively related to the emergence of charismatic leadership in intact work groups (Pillai & Meindl, 1998). At the organizational level, work units that achieved a high level of fit between unit cultural value orientations and management practices were more profitable than those that did not achieve a fit (Newman & Nollen, 1996). Thus, Hofstede's (1980a) original call for cultural sensitivity when implementing management initiatives was supported by studies at multiple levels of analysis. The results of most of the moderating studies at the individual level of analysis generally paralleled the results found in the direct effect studies with one key exception: all of the moderating effects studies concerned the effects of individualism-collectivism, power distance, or both, without considering the remaining three cultural values (as at least a few of the individual level direct effect studies had).

Studies examining the similar effects at different levels of analysis demonstrated consistency with regard to particular outcome variables. For example, research on direct effects of culture at the individual level showed that individualists preferred more direct, adversary-

based conflict handling styles compared to collectivists (Cocroft & Ting-Toomey, 1994; Leung, 1987). These findings were reinforced by country-level findings providing evidence that individualism-collectivism is related to whether managers choose to avoid or compete in conflict situations (Morris et al., 1998). Findings demonstrating a negative relationship between collectivism and preferences for individual-based pay at the individual level of analysis within the U.S. (Cable & Judge, 1994; Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998) were supported by cross-country level findings regarding the positive association between individualism and performance-based, individualistic rewards (Schuler & Rogovsky, 1998). The link between collectivism and affective organizational commitment was supported at both the individual level (Clugston et al., 2000; Kirkman and Shapiro, in press) and a group level study (Palich et al., 1995). Finally, collectivism was positively associated with cooperation in individual- (Bennett, 1999; Wagner, 1995; Gelfand & Realo, 1999; Probst et al., 1999), group- (Cox et al., 1991; Eby & Dobbins, 1997; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2000b; Oetzel, 1998), and organizational-level studies (Steensma et al., in press; Chatman & Barsade, 1995).

A few studies conducted at different levels of analysis complemented one another in their cross-cultural findings. For example, at the individual level, collectivism was negatively related to the use of selection tests (Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998) while at the country level, uncertainty avoidance was positively related to the number to different selection test types and the extent of selection testing (Ryan et al., 1999). At the individual level of analysis, collectivism had a direct, positive effect on charismatic leadership among managers (Pillai & Meindl, 1998), and collectivism moderated the impact of leadership style on idea generation such that collectivists generated more ideas working with a transformational leader rather than a transactional leader (Jung & Avolio, 1999).

Levels of analysis do matter. In contrast to studies that reinforced or complemented each other, our review also revealed that results sometimes differ depending on the level of analysis at which the study was conducted. For example, at the group level of analysis, uncertainty avoidance was negatively related, masculinity was positively related, and power distance was unrelated to organizational commitment (Palich et al., 1995). In direct contrast, at the individual level of analysis, both power distance and uncertainty avoidance were positively related to organizational commitment but no effects were found for masculinity. At the individual level, cultural distance on collectivism was negatively related to group receptiveness (Thomas, 1999), whereas at the group level, heterogeneity on collectivism was positively related to group performance (Elron, 1997). Clearly, more research is needed on these outcome variables at multiple levels of analysis to untangle these discrepancies. We encourage future researchers to take level of analysis into consideration when developing the conceptual aspects of their work and when comparing their findings to other studies.

Interpret causal relationships carefully. To support a culture to behavior causal connection, some researchers fall back on the assumption that cultural values are established early in childhood, are relatively stable over time, and tend to generate (rather than be changed by) the experiences or behavior of individuals. However, research that demonstrates changes in cultural values over time speaks to the difficulty of resting on assumptions of cultural stability (Birbaum-More & Wong, 1995; Craig, Douglas, & Grein, 1992; Heuer, Cummings, & Hutabarat, 1999; Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1993; Ralston et al., 1997; Ralston, Egri, Stewart, Terpstra, & Kaicheng, 1999; Selmer & DeLeon, 1996).

As Smith and Bond (1999) pointed out, the very fact that the title of Hofstede's (1980a) original manuscript contains the words "*Culture's Consequences*" implies a causal link between

national culture and the attitudes and behaviors of people living within a culture. For example, Hofstede found a high correlation (i.e.,  $r = .82$ ) between country scores on individualism and gross national product (GNP). Such a relationship might lead one to jump to the conclusion that wealth creation is caused by high levels of individualism within nations. However, as Hofstede himself (1980a) warns, just the opposite could be true. Prosperity might cause people to become more individualistic.

Unless there is concrete longitudinal data that can support a culture to behavior causal link, researchers are urged to speak more generally (or not at all) about the causal connections they find between culture and various “outcomes.” One interesting natural field study would be to investigate changes in countries that have experienced sudden national prosperity (e.g., Brunei, Kuwait, or Qatar) to explore the impact of wealth effects on cultural values. Researchers have already discovered long-term generational shifts in values within slowly industrializing nations (Ralston et al., 1999). We now turn to other specific recommendations for future research on cultural values.

### Recommendations and Directions for Future Research

Our review of Hofstede-inspired research revealed several important considerations for future research. We discuss in turn below the need to include actual measures of cultural values in research, the importance of addressing a variety of cultural values in each study, and the need to explore a broader selection of criterion variables, particularly at the group and organizational levels of analysis.

Include measures of the cultural values. One of the strongest suggestions we can offer for conducting research using Hofstede’s (1980a) framework is to include actual measures of the cultural values. In order to increase the comprehensiveness of our review, we did include some



studies that used Hofstede's country scores rather than direct measures of cultural values. In fact, most of the studies that included cultural distance as a predictor variable constructed measures of distance from the country scores that Hofstede arrived at in his original study (Kogut & Singh, 1988). In support of using country scores rather than direct measures of culture, Morosini et al. (1998) pointed out that country scores help to avoid problems of common method variance, retrospective evaluations of national culture, and retrospective rationalizations that might be present using direct measures. However, these issues can be overcome with a careful research design or (secondarily) post-hoc statistical checks (see Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). We contend that assigning cultural value scores to individuals (or subsets of individuals) within countries presents difficult obstacles to overcome and is a much more serious concern than common method variance or retrospection.

Further support for using actual cultural value measures rather than country scores comes from studies that demonstrated the possibility for individuals from a particular country to be simultaneously more individualistic *and* collectivistic, on average, than individuals from another country; and from studies that failed to support cultural value differences between countries. For example, Cocroft and Ting-Toomey (1994) found that Japanese students scored higher on measures of both individualism *and* collectivism than did U.S. subjects; Gabrielidis and Stephan (1997) found that Mexican subjects were more collectivistic *and* individualistic than U.S. subjects; Leung and Iwawaki (1988) found that Japanese and U.S. subjects did not differ on collectivism; and Stephan et al. (1998) found that U.S. subjects scored higher than Japanese subjects on two out of three of Triandis et al.'s (1988) collectivism subscales. One possible explanation is that Hofstede's (1980a) cultural values are bi-polar rather than uni-polar. That is, individuals, groups, organizations and countries can be high or low on both individualism *and*

collectivism simultaneously, for example, as some researchers have suggested (Gelfand, Triandis, & Chan, 1996; Maznevski, DiStefano, Gomez, Noorderhaven, & Wu, 1997). Thus, using country scores as proxy measures could again result in erroneous conclusions based on incorrect assignment of cultural values.

The presence of intra-cultural variation on the cultural values also points to the importance of including measures of cultural values rather than assigning country scores to individuals (e.g., Bochner & Hesketh, 1994; Offermann & Hellmann, 1997). For example, Au (1999) found that intra-cultural variation (ICV) on certain constructs was greater than inter-cultural variation when comparing multiple countries. Au's findings demonstrate that simply assigning country scores to individuals might overlook important variation within countries. As Hofstede (1980a) noted, there is significant variation within each country on the cultural values even though, on average, many countries are different from one another.

Finally, countries composed of two or more subcultures should preclude researchers from using country scores when examining differences. Examples include the Flemish and French subcultures of Belgium, the French and English subcultures of Canada, and the regional differences in culture between Northern and Southern Mexico. Researchers examining cultural values within single nations have demonstrated the potential for significant cultural differences between regions or subcultures (e.g., Punnett & Withan, 1990; Ralston et al., 1999; Selmer & DeLeon, 1996; Vandello & Cohen, 1999). Hofstede's (1980a, p. 335) own data analysis demonstrated that the German-speaking region of Switzerland had "a wide cultural gap" with the French-speaking region. Using actual measures of the cultural values will help to ensure accurate determinations of specific regional variation within countries.

We are particularly cautionary with respect to studies that, after assessing country differences on one or more of the cultural values, then used country as a predictor variable rather than the culture values directly (e.g., Arunachalam et al., 1998; Mann et al., 1985; Tinsley & Pillutla, 1998; Tower et al., 1997). If one's intent is to assess the impact of cultural value differences on specific outcomes, using country as a predictor variable (once country differences on a cultural value have been established) does not fully test these relationships. For example, Tinsley and Pillutla (1998) found that Hong Kong Chinese subjects were higher on collectivism, and lower on individualism, than U.S. American subjects. Country was then used in all analyses to determine the effects of cultural differences. On the basis of significant effects for country, Tinsley and Pillutla (1998, p. 722) conclude, "Finally, our results suggest that cultural values create an environment in which some negotiation strategies are selected to survive over others." However, the research design did not allow for the ruling out of other country differences that might be driving the results and no cultural values were included directly in any analyses (Lytle et al., 1995). The only conclusion one can draw from their results is that Hong Kong and U.S. American negotiators differ and that these differences are most likely due to effects that their study could not account for.

A preferred strategy to assess the impact of culture on outcomes would be to control for the specific cultural values and then test for country differences. Once cultural value scores have been controlled for, previously significant country differences often disappear lending support to cultural values as an explanation for the differences (e.g., Earley, 1994; Gibson, 1999; Hui et al., 1991). Using a similar strategy, Gomez et al. (in press) found that collectivism did not fully account for country differences in evaluation generosity of team members in Mexico and the U.S. Had a direct measure of collectivism not been included, this finding would have been

masked. Another similar strategy is to run separate analyses substituting cultural values for country to determine whether similar results emerge. In their study of negotiation style preferences between Brazilian and U.S. American negotiators, Pearson and Stephan (1998) obtained highly similar results regardless of whether country or individualism-collectivism was used in the analysis. We strongly urge future researchers to use one (or more) of these methods to help support theoretical arguments that specific cultural value differences, and not country differences in general, are responsible for the results obtained. Without such procedures, strong conclusions about cultural value effects cannot be drawn.

Move beyond single cultural value studies. Many of the studies we reviewed investigated only individualism-collectivism. For example, of the 59 studies that investigated direct effects at the individual level, only 11 included cultural values other than individualism-collectivism. However, clearly individuals are influenced by a complex set of cultural values (Kirkman & Shapiro, 1997; Lytle et al., 1995). Indeed, of the studies that did include other cultural values in addition to, or besides, individualism-collectivism, all 11 found significant effects. Moreover, of four the studies that included both individualism-collectivism and other cultural values *simultaneously* in analyses (e.g., Clugston et al., 2000; Earley, 1986; Kirkman & Shapiro, in press; Mitchell et al., in press), all four found effects for cultural values on individual outcomes *beyond* those accounted for by individualism-collectivism. Such a consistent level of significant findings suggest that including cultural values other than individualism-collectivism can generate interesting and important results.

Similarly, in studies that examined the effects of country and individualism-collectivism together, some research showed that country remained a significant predictor of outcomes even after individualism-collectivism was taken into account (e.g., Gomez et al., in press; Hui et al.,

1991). The likely explanation for this “hidden” variance is that there are other cultural values driving the findings, but such relationships remain unexplored since only individualism-collectivism was measured. Such findings demonstrate the importance of including multiple cultural values in future studies to capture a more complete picture of individual attitudes and behavior (Lytle et al., 1995).

Perhaps the choice of criterion variables such as reward allocation, conflict management, negotiation, and ingroup-outgroup behavior of individuals predisposed researchers to choose the one cultural value that has the most intuitive appeal as a predictor variable. However, we believe such reasoning is shortsighted. For example, in reward allocation or negotiation studies, including the status of the allocator, reward recipient, or negotiators (e.g., Leung & Lind, 1986) could make power distance an important predictor. In high power distance countries, allocators may be more generous with those recipients high, rather than low, in status (Hofstede, 1980a). Given the emergence of team-based reward allocations (DeMatteo, Eby, & Sundstrom, 1998) and the fact that some teams consist of members with varied levels of status (Cohen & Bailey, 1997), such research would be both timely and relevant to organizations. It is also interesting to note the large number of individual level criterion variables that have not been investigated for the impact of cultural influences including absenteeism, turnover, innovation, creativity, or workplace violence.

Furthermore, while we do not necessarily advocate the use of cultural distance measures based on Hofstede's (1980a) country scores (for the reasons discussed above), we do acknowledge the potential for constructing these distance measures from actual cultural value differences obtained from survey measures. As shown in the numerous studies on cultural distance effects, using an overall *composite* index of cultural values (i.e., calculated using all four

or five of Hofstede's cultural values together) may lead to misleading interpretations of findings. For example, while some studies found negative effects for cultural distance on such outcomes as foreign direct investment (Li & Guisinger, 1992; Loree & Guisinger, 1995) and firm or expansion performance (Datta & Puia, 1995; Luo & Peng, 1999), other studies found no effects (Benito & Gripsrud, 1992; Gomez-Mejia & Palich, 1997) and still others found positive effects (Morrison et al., 1998; Park & Ungson, 1997).

These mixed findings may perhaps be the result of the composite analysis used by these researchers. By breaking down the overall cultural distance measure into more specific distance measures based on each cultural value separately (e.g., Barkema & Vermeulen, 1997; Shenkar and Zeira, 1992), insightful findings have been obtained. For example, while Shenkar and Zeira (1992) found that overall cultural distance was not related to CEO role ambiguity, cultural distance on both individualism-collectivism and uncertainty avoidance was negatively related to role ambiguity. Similarly, Barkema and Vermeulen (1997) found that the negative effects of overall cultural distance on the survival of international joint ventures was explained by cultural distance on uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation, specifically. Thus, we recommend using more fine-grained models that include separate indices of cultural distance for each of Hofstede's (1980a) cultural values. Such a strategy is likely to help to address the mixed findings that exist in the literature on cultural distance.

Similar to the cultural distance studies, other sets of studies demonstrated the importance of testing more fine-grained models when assessing the impact of cultural values. The conflicting findings in the reward allocation studies provide a good example. While some researchers found effects for individualism-collectivism on allocator preferences for equal or equitable distributions (Hui et al., 1991; Leung & Iwawaki, 1988; Mann et al., 1985), other

studies found no effects (McLean Parks et al., 1999) or found that all subjects preferred equity distributions (Gomez et al., in press). The confusion resulting from these studies can be mitigated when one examines other studies that took a more-fine grained approach by including important conditions or moderating variables.

For example, Tower et al. (1997) found that British and Russian allocators only differed in their decision rule when performance of the allocator was low rather than high. Similarly, Chen et al. (1998) found that achievement motivation was negatively related to differential allocation in both Hong Kong and the U.S. when task interdependence was high; however, when task interdependence was low, the findings held for Hong Kong but were opposite for the U.S. A series of studies showed that the ingroup-outgroup distinction played an important role in the allocation rules of collectivists compared to individualists (Gomez et al., in press; Hui et al., 1991; Tower et al., 1997).

Such findings show that differential effects of individualism-collectivism (and, by extension, other cultural values) across countries seem to matter only when certain conditions are present. Traditional demographic factors such as age, gender, and education which are routinely collected in most research studies should also be investigated, not just for comparing mean differences as a rough proxy for sample equivalence, but for their potential moderating effects across cultures (e.g., Farh, Lind, & Earley, 1997). We encourage researchers to continue to resolve conflicting findings by including important moderators in direct effects research.

Explore new territory in terms of criterion variables. A final suggestion we offer for future research pertains to the selection of topics and levels of analysis. In preparing this review, we were struck by the influence of levels of analysis on researcher preferences for criterion measures. While some measures are clearly inappropriate at the individual level (e.g., licensing,

foreign direct investment) and others have less utility at organizational and country levels of analysis (e.g., personality), the majority of criterion variables have *not* been investigated at more than one level of analysis. A strong trend in cross-cultural research has been the adaptation of Hofstede's (1980a) original measures for research on individual behavior and attitudes. What has remained conspicuously absent from Hofstede-inspired research is attention to cultural values at the group or organizational levels of analysis.

Regarding groups, the assessment of cultural values at this level has only recently emerged as a viable stream of research (e.g., Earley, 1999; Eby & Dobbins, 1997; Gibson, 1999; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2000b). One requirement for assessing group level cultural values is to target the measure to the level of interest (Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980). Thus, survey measures should ask respondents about the cultural values *of their groups*. However, it must be shown that conceptually it makes sense to view cultural values as group attributes. Once conceptual considerations are satisfied, it is often necessary to aggregate individual responses (i.e., on a survey) to the group level. To support aggregation, researchers must show that there is more variation *between* groups than *within* using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure or within-and-between-analysis (WABA); and there must be evidence of high interrater agreement on the variables of interest using a reliability-within-groups ( $r_{wg}$ ) analysis or an intraclass correlation (ICC) procedure (Bar-Tal, 1990). Researchers following these guides have been able to demonstrate that cultural values can be viewed as group-level phenomena (see Gibson, 1999, and Kirkman and Shapiro, 2000b, for current examples of these procedures). Their findings suggest that cultural values can vary strongly between groups and do influence behavior at the group level. Also lacking is attention to the cultural diversity of groups (Williams & O'Reilly, 1998). As organizations continue to become more culturally diverse, research on how cultural



diversity affects group outcomes will take on increasing importance. Future researchers are encouraged to continue these relatively new but promising lines of research.

Research on cultural values at the organizational level has had a longer history than research on groups but there remain relatively few articles in comparison to the country or individual levels. In the field, researchers have found that cultural values at the organizational level affect the level of entrepreneurial behavior in firms (Morris et al., 1993; 1994), the profitability of firms based on cultural value fit with management practices (Newman & Nollen, 1996), the odds of using alliances as a result of perceived general uncertainty (Dickson & Weaver, 1997), and the propensity of manufacturing firms to cooperate with other firms for technological innovation (Steensma et al., in press). In experimental research, cultural values at the organizational level were shown to affect behavior related to groups and behavior in diverse versus homogeneous work units (Chatman & Barsade, 1995; Chatman et al., 1998). Researchers have long known that organizational culture exerts powerful influences on individual attitudes and behavior (Schein, 1985). A natural extension of this research may then be to assess the effects of organizational culture using Hofstede's (1980a) cultural values framework.

In addition, many of the criterion variables have been investigated only at one level of analysis, when multiple levels are potentially important. For example, the impact of culture on organizational citizenship behavior was investigated only at the individual level of analysis (Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Van Dyne et al., 2000). Yet it seems clear that culture has implications for organizational citizenship behavior at the group and perhaps the organizational levels of analysis. One might reasonably hypothesize that culture moderates the relationship between a number of inputs (e.g., leadership behaviors, work group resources, human resource

practices) and organizational citizenship behavior. Yet we found no studies in our review that investigated the moderating effects of culture on OCB.

As a second example of single-level focus, the impact of culture on entrepreneurial behavior was investigated only at the organizational level of analysis. Since the notion of entrepreneurship is rooted in individual level behavior, it is curious that there are no empirical studies that investigate this relationship. One might hypothesize that culture is related to the entrepreneurial behavior of groups and teams but again we found no Hofstede-inspired empirical studies investigating that hypothesis. Equally curious, given that Hofstede's (1980a) measures were conceived as national level measures of cultures, is the absence of studies linking national culture to the entrepreneurial behavior of nations.

A final example of this opportunity for future research is that the impact of culture on change management outcomes was investigated only at the individual level of analysis. Since change management programs are typically targeted at organizations or major components of organizations (e.g., strategic business units, divisions, operations) rather than at changing specific individuals (Macy & Izumi, 1993), this seems a fruitful area for future research. Missing from a focus on the individual level would be rich information on how culture and cultural diversity impact the acceptance and meaning making that groups, teams, coalitions, and other linking mechanisms in the organization give to change management efforts.

In addition to levels of analysis opportunities, a careful review of Tables 3, 4, and 5 reveals many additional gaps that can be addressed by future Hofstede-inspired research. These areas include: the relationship between culture and reward allocation at the group or organizational level; decision making or goal acceptance at the group, organization or country levels; role conflict/role ambiguity at the individual, group, or organization levels; and

negotiation studies at the organization or country level of analysis. In essence, “culture’s consequences” have been explored primarily at the individual and country levels of analysis. We urge cross-cultural researchers to investigate the theoretically useful opportunities evident in our review so that we may all better understand the direct and moderating impact of culture on important organizational criteria at multiple levels of analysis.

### Conclusion

We have reviewed 127 articles that adopted Hofstede’s (1980a) cultural value dimensions to conduct empirical research in management and applied psychology journals and a variety of international management/psychology journals. The findings are broad and impactful. However, despite this plethora of research, important questions about the role of cultural differences remain. We encourage researchers to adopt the recommendations we have put forth here in order to more accurately and effectively utilize Hofstede’s framework in future research. Perhaps the most important contribution of *Culture’s Consequences* is that it has provided a common language for cross-cultural management researchers to elevate their dialogue about cultural differences. Our review suggests that the language of *Culture’s Consequences* will continue to be spoken for many years to come.

## References

- Abu-Saad, I. (1998). Individualism and Islamic work beliefs. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *29*, 377-383.
- Ali, A.J. (1993). Decision-making style, individualism, and attitudes toward risk of Arab executives. International Studies of Management & Organization, *23*, 53-73.
- Anakwe, U.P., Kessler, E.H., & Christensen, E.W. (1999). Distance learning and cultural diversity: Potential users' perspective. The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, *7*, 224-243.
- Arunachalam, V., Wall, J.A., Jr., & Chan, C. (1998). Hong Kong versus U.S. negotiations: Effects of culture, alternatives, outcome scales, and mediation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *28*, 1219-1244.
- Au, K.Y. (1999). Intra-cultural variation: Evidence and implications for international business. Journal of International Business Studies, *30*, 799-812.
- Barkema, H.G., Bell, J.H.J., & Pennings, J.M. (1996). Foreign entry, cultural barriers, and learning. Strategic Management Journal, *17*, 151-166.
- Barkema, H.G., Shenkar, O., Vermeulen, F., & Bell, J.H.J. (1997). Working abroad, working with others: How firms learn to operate international joint ventures. Academy of Management Journal, *40*, 426-442.
- Barkema, H.G., & Vermeulen, F. (1998). International expansion through start-up or acquisition: A learning perspective. Academy of Management Journal, *41*, 7-26.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1990). Group beliefs. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, *42*, 155-162.

Benito, G.R.G., & Gripsrud, G. (1992). The expansion of foreign direct investments: Discrete rational location choices or a cultural learning process? Journal of International Business, 23, 461-476.

Bennett, R.H., III. (1999). The relative effects of situational practices and culturally influenced values/beliefs on work attitudes. International Journal of Commerce & Management, 9, 84-102.

Birnbaum-More, P.H., & Wong, G.Y.Y. (1995). Acquisition of managerial values in the People's Republic of China and Hong Kong. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26, 255-275.

Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (1994). Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25, 233-257.

Brett, J.M., & Okumura, T. (1998). Inter- and intracultural negotiation: U.S. and Japanese negotiators. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 495-510.

Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J.R., Gelfand, M.J., Francesco, A.M., Chen, Z.X., Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gomez, C.B., Kirkman, B.L., & Shapiro, D.L. (in press). Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on reactions to voice. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.

Brockner, J., Chen, Y., Mannix, E.A., Leung, K., & Skarlicki, D.P. (2000). Culture and procedural fairness: When the effects of what you do depend on how you do it. Administrative Science Quarterly, 45, 138-159.

Brouthers, K.D., & Brouthers, L.E. (2000). Acquisition or greenfield start-up? Institutional, cultural, and transaction cost influences. Strategic Management Journal, 21, 89-97.

Cable, D.M., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective. Personnel Psychology, *47*, 317-348.

Casimir, G., & Keats, D. (1996). The effects of work environment and in-group membership on the leadership preferences of Anglo-Australians and Chinese Australians. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *27*, 436-357.

Chatman, J.A., & Barsade, S.G. (1995). Personality, organizational culture, and cooperation: Evidence from a business simulation. Administrative Science Quarterly, *40*, 423-443.

Chatman, J.A., Polzer, J.T., Barsade, S.G., & Neale, M.A. (1998). Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. Administrative Science Quarterly, *43*, 749-780.

Chen, C.C. (1995). New trends in reward allocation preferences: A Sino-U.S. comparison. Academy of Management Journal, *38*, 408-428.

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

Chen, C.C., Meindl, J.R., & Hui, H. (1998). Deciding on equity or parity: A test of situational, cultural, and individual factors. Journal of Organizational Behavior, *19*, 115-129.

Chen, Y., Brockner, J., & Katz, T. (1998). Toward an explanation of cultural differences in in-group favoritism: The role of individual versus collective primacy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *75*, 1490-1502.

Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *18*, 143-164.

Clugston, M., Howell, J.P., & Dorfman, P.W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? Journal of Management, 26, 5-30.

Cocroft, B.K., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). Facework in Japan and the United States. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18, 469-506.

Cohen, S.G., & Bailey, D.E. (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness from the shop floor to the executive suite. Journal of Management, 23, 239-290.

Cox, T.H., Lobel, S.A., & McLeod, P.L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 827-847.

Craig, C.S., Douglas, S.P., Grein, A. (1992). Patterns of convergence and divergence among industrialized nations: 1960-1988. Journal of International Business Studies, 23, 773-787.

Datta, D.K., Puia, G. (1995). Cross-border acquisitions: An examination of the influence of relatedness and cultural fit on shareholder value creation in U.S. acquiring firms. Management International Review, 35, 337-359.

DeMatteo, J.S., Eby, L.T., & Sundstrom, E. (1998). Team-based rewards: Current empirical evidence and directions for future research. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, vol. 20 (pp. 141-183). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Dickson, P.H., & Weaver, K.M. (1997). Environmental determinants and individual-level moderators of alliance use. Academy of Management Journal, 40, 404-425.

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 653-663.

Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 851-864.

Dorfman, P.W., & Howell, J.P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 3, 127-150.

Earley, P.C. (1986). Trust, perceived importance of praise and criticism, and work performance: An examination of feedback in the United States and England. *Journal of Management*, 12, 457-473.

Earley, P.C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 565-581.

Earley, P.C. (1993). East meets West meets Mideast: Further explorations of collectivistic and individualistic work groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 319-348.

Earley, P.C. (1994). Self or group? Cultural effects of training on self-efficacy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 89-117.

Earley, P.C. (1999). Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 80, 192-212.

Earley, P.C., & Gibson, C.B. (1998). Taking stock in our progress on individualism-collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community. *Journal of Management*, 24, 265-304.

Earley, P.C., Gibson, C.B., & Chen, C.C. (1999). "How did I do?" versus "How did we do?" Cultural contrasts of performance feedback use and self-efficacy. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 594-619.

Eby, L.T., Adams, D.M., Russell, J.E.A., & Gaby, S.H. (2000). Perceptions of organizational readiness for change: Factors related to employees' reactions to the implementation of team-based selling. *Human Relations*, 53, 419-442.



Eby, L.T., & Dobbins, G.H. (1997). Collectivistic orientation in teams: An individual and group-level analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18, 275-295.

Elron, E. (1997). Top management teams within multinational corporations: Effects of cultural heterogeneity. Leadership Quarterly, 8, 393-412.

Erez, M., & Earley, P.C. (1987). Comparative analysis of goal-setting strategies across cultures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 658-665.

Erez, M., & Somech, A. (1996). Is group productivity loss the rule or the exception? Effects of culture and group-based motivation. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 1513-1537.

Erramilli, M.K. (1996). Nationality and subsidiary ownership patterns in multinational corporations. Journal of International Business Studies, 27, 225-248.

Extejt, M.M., & Smith, J.E. (1990). The behavioral sciences and management: An evaluation of relevant journals. Journal of Management, 16, 539-551.

Eylon, D., & Au, K.Y. (1999). Exploring empowerment cross-cultural differences along the power distance dimension. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23, 373-385.

Farh, J.L., Earley, P.C., & Lin, S.C. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. Administrative Science Quarterly, 42, 421-444.

Franke, R. H., Hofstede, G. & Bond, M.H. (1991). Cultural roots of economic performance: A research note. Strategic Management Journal, 12, 165-73.

Freeman, M.A. (1997). Demographic correlates of individualism and collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28, 321-341.

Gabrielidis, C., & Stephan, W.G. (1997). Preferred styles of conflict resolution. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28, 661-677.

Gaines, S.O., Jr., Marelich, W.D., Bledsoe, K.L., Steers, W.N., Henderson, M.C., Granrose, C.S., Barajas, L., Hicks, D., Lyde, J., Takahashi, Y., Yum, N., Rios, D.I., Garcia, B.F., Farris, K.R., & Page, M.S. (1997). Links between race/ethnicity and cultural values as mediated by racial/ethnic identity and moderated by gender. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *72*, 1460-1476.

Geletkanycz, M.A. (1997). The salience of 'Culture's Consequences': The effects of cultural values on top executive commitment to the status quo. Strategic Management Journal, *18*, 615-634.

Gelfand, M.J., & Realo, A. (1999). Individualism-collectivism and accountability in intergroup negotiations. Journal of Applied Psychology, *84*, 721-736.

Gelfand, M.J., Triandis, H.C., & Chan, D.K. (1996). Individualism versus collectivism or versus authoritarianism? European Journal of Social Psychology, *26*, 397-410.

Gibson, C.B. (1999). Do they do what they believe they can? Group efficacy and group effectiveness across tasks and cultures. Academy of Management Journal, *42*, 138-152.

Gomez, C.B., Kirkman, B.L., & Shapiro, D.L. (in press). The impact of collectivism and ingroup/outgroup membership on the evaluation generosity of team members. Academy of Management Journal.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R., & Balkin, D.B. (1992). Determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. Academy of Management Journal, *35*, 921-955.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R., & Palich, L.E. (1997). Cultural diversity and the performance of multinational firms. Journal of International Business Studies, *28*, 309-335.

Goodwin, R., Hizharadze, G., Luu, L.A.N., Kosa, E., & Emelyanova, T. (1999). Glasnost and the art of conversation: A multilevel analysis of intimate disclosure across three former communist cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30, 72-90.

Goregenli, M. (1997). Individualist-collectivist tendencies in a Turkish sample. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28, 787-794.

Grimm, S.D., Church, A.T., Katigbak, M.S., & Reyes, J.A.S. (1999). Self-described traits, values, and moods associated with individualism and collectivism: Testing I-C theory in an individualistic (U.S.) and a collectivistic (Philippine) culture. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30, 466-500.

Helgstrand, K.K., & Stulmacher, A.F. (1999). National culture: An influence on leader evaluations? International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 7, 153-168.

Hennart, J., & Larimo, J. (1998). The impact of culture on the strategy of multinational enterprises: Does national origin affect ownership decisions? Journal of International Business Studies, 29, 515-538.

Heuer, M., Cummings, J.L., & Hutabarat, W. (1999). Cultural stability or change among managers in Indonesia? Journal of International Business Studies, 30, 599-610.

Hofstede, G. (1980a). Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1980b). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? Organizational Dynamics, 9, 42-63.

Hofstede, G. (1983). Dimensions of national culture in fifty countries and three regions. In J.B. Deregowski, S. Dziurawiec, & R.C. Annis (Eds.), Expiscations in cross-cultural psychology (pp. 335-355). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10, 301-320.

Hofstede, G. (1996). Gender stereotypes and partner preferences of Asian women in masculine and feminine cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27, 533-546.

Hofstede, G. (1998). Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimensions of national cultures. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M.H. (1984). Hofstede's cultural dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's Value Survey. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15, 417-433.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M.H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. Organizational Dynamics, 16, 5-21.

Hoppe, M.H. (1990). A comparative study of country elites: International differences in work-related values and learning and their implications for management training and development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M.W., Gupta, V., and Associates. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W.H. Mobley, M.J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), Advances in global leadership, Vol. 1 (pp. 171-233). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hui, C.H., Triandis, H.C., & Yee, C. (1991). Cultural differences in reward allocation: Is collectivism the explanation? British Journal of Social Psychology, 30, 145-157.

Hui, C.H., & Villareal, M.J. (1989). Individualism-collectivism and psychological needs. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20, 310-323.

Husted, B.W. (1999). Wealth, culture, and corruption. Journal of International Business Studies, 30, 339-360.

Jaegar, A.M. (1986). Organization development and national culture: Where's the fit? Academy of Management Review, *11*, 178-190.

James, K. (1993). Enhancing the perceived self-relevance of technology to influence attitudes and information retention. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, *29*, 56-75.

Johnson, J.L., & Podsakoff, P.M. (1994). Journal influence in the field of management: An analysis using Salancik's index in a dependency network. Academy of Management Journal, *37*, 1392-1407.

Jung, D.I., & Avolio, B.J. (1999). Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. Academy of Management Journal, *42*, 208-218.

Kashlak, R.J., Chandran, R., & Di Benedetto, C.A. (1998). Reciprocity in international business: A study of telecommunications alliances and contracts. Journal of International Business Studies, *29*, 281-304.

Kemmelmeier, M., Burnstein, E., & Peng, K. (1999). Individualism and authoritarianism shape attitudes toward physician-assisted suicide. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *29*, 2613-2631.

Kirkman, B.L., & Shapiro, D.L. (1997). The impact of cultural values on employee resistance to teams: Toward a model of globalized self-managing work team effectiveness. Academy of Management Review, *22*, 730-757.

Kirkman, B.L., & Shapiro, D.L. (2000a). Understanding why team members won't share: An examination of factors related to employee receptivity to team-based rewards. Small Group Research, *31*, 175-209.

Kirkman, B.L. & Shapiro, D.L. (2000b). The impact of team members' cultural values on productivity, cooperation, and empowerment in self-managing work teams. Unpublished working paper. University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Kirkman, B.L., & Shapiro, D.L. (in press). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. Academy of Management Journal.

Kluckhohn, F.R., & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. Journal of International Business Studies, 19, 411-432.

Leung, K. (1987). Some determinants of reactions to procedural models for conflict resolution: A cross-national study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 898-908.

Leung, K. (1988). Some determinants of conflict avoidance. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19, 125-136.

Leung, K., & Iwawaki, S. (1988). Cultural collectivism and distributive behavior. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19, 35-49.

Leung, K., & Lind, E.A. (1986). Procedural justice and culture: Effects of culture, gender, and investigator status on procedural preferences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 1134-1140.

Li, J., & Guisinger, S. (1992). The globalization of service multinationals in the "Triad" regions: Japan, Western Europe, and North America. Journal of International Business Studies, 23, 675-696.

Lind, E.A., Tyler, T.R., & Huo, Y.J. (1997). Procedural context and culture: Variation in the antecedents of procedural justice judgments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *73*, 767-780.

Loree, D.W., & Guisinger, S.E. (1995). Policy and non-policy determinants of U.S. equity foreign direct investment. Journal of International Business Studies, *26*, 281-299.

Luo, Y., & Peng, M.W. (1999). Learning to compete in a transition economy: Experience, environment, and performance. Journal of International Business Studies, *30*, 269-296.

Lynn, M., Zinkhan, G.M., & Harris, J. (1993). Consumer tipping: A cross-country study. Journal of Consumer Research, *20*, 478-488.

Lytle, A.L., Brett, J.M., Barsness, Z.I., Tinsley, C.H., & Janssens, M. (1995). A paradigm for confirmatory cross-cultural research in organizational behavior. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, vol. 17 (pp. 167-214). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Macy, B.A., & Izumi, H. (1993). Organizational change, design, and work innovation: A meta-analysis of 131 North American field studies – 1961-1991. In R. Woodman & W. Pasmore (Eds.), Research in organizational change and development, vol. 7 (pp. 235-313). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Mann, L., Radford, M., & Kanagawa, C. (1985). Cross-cultural differences in children's use of decision rules: A comparison between Japan and Australia. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *49*, 1557-1564.

Marshall, R. (1997). Variances in levels of individualism across two cultures and three social classes. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *28*, 490-495.

Matsumoto, D. (1989). Cultural influences on the perception of emotion. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *20*, 92-105.

Maznevski, M.L., DiStefano, J.J., Gomez, C.B., Noorderhaven, N.G., & Wu, P. (1997). The cultural orientations framework and international management research. Paper presented at the Academy of International Business annual meeting, Guadalajara, Mexico.

McClelland, D.C. (1967). The achieving society. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

McClelland, G.H., & Judd, C.M. (1993). Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects. Psychological Bulletin, 114, 376-390.

McGill, A.L. (1995). American and Thai managers' explanations for poor company performance: Role of perspective and culture in causal selection. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 61, 16-27.

McLean Parks, J., Conlon, D.E., Ang, S., & Bontempo, R. (1999). The manager giveth, the manager taketh away: Variation in distribution/recovery rules due to resource type and cultural orientation. Journal of Management, 25, 723-757.

Merritt, A. (2000). Culture in the cockpit: Do Hofstede's dimensions replicate? Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31, 283-301.

Mitchell, R.K., Smith, B., Seawright, K.W., & Morse, E.A. (in press). Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation decision. Academy of Management Journal.

Moorman, R.H., & Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16, 127-142.

Morosini, P., Shane, S., & Singh, H. (1998). National cultural distance and cross-border acquisition performance. Journal of International Business Studies, 29, 137-158.



Morris, M.H., Avila, R.A., & Allen, J.W. (1993). Individualism and the modern corporation: Implications for innovation and entrepreneurship. Journal of Management, *19*, 595-612.

Morris, M.H., Davis, D.L., & Allen, J.W. (1994). Fostering corporate entrepreneurship: Cross-cultural comparisons of the importance of individualism versus collectivism. Journal of International Business Studies, *25*, 65-89.

Morris, M.W., Williams, K.Y., Leung, K., Larrick, R., Mendoza, M.T., Bhatnagar, D., Li, J., Kondo, M., Luo, J., & Hu, J. (1998). Conflict management style: Accounting for cross-national differences. Journal of International Business Studies, *29*, 729-748.

Newman, K.L., & Nollen, S.D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. Journal of International Business Studies, *27*, 753-779.

Nooteboom, B., Berger, H., & Noorderhaven, N.G. (1997). Effects of trust and governance on relational risk. Academy of Management Journal, *40*, 308-338.

Oetzzel, J.G. (1998). Culturally homogeneous and heterogeneous groups: Explaining communication processes through individualism-collectivism and self-construal. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, *22*, 135-161.

Offerman, L.R., & Hellmann, P.S. (1997). Culture's consequences for leadership behavior. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *28*, 342-351.

Oishi, S., Wyer, R.S., Jr., & Colcombe, S.J. (2000). Cultural variation in the use of current life satisfaction to predict the future. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *78*, 434-445.

Oyserman, D. (1993). The lens of personhood: Viewing the self and others in a multicultural society. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *65*, 993-1009.

Oyserman, D., & Sakamoto, I. (1997). Being Asian American: Identity, cultural constructs, and stereotype perception. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33, 435-453.

Oyserman, D., Sakamoto, I., & Lauffer, A. (1998). Cultural accommodation: Hybridity and the framing of social obligation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1606-1618.

Ozawa, K., Crosby, M., & Crosby, F. (1996). Individualism and resistance to affirmative action: A comparison of Japanese and American samples. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26, 1138-1152.

Palich, L.E., Hom, P.W., & Griffeth, R.W. (1995). Managing in the international context: Testing the cultural generality of sources of commitment to multinational enterprises. Journal of Management, 21, 671-690.

Pan, Y. (1996). Influences on foreign equity ownership level in joint ventures in China. Journal of International Business Studies, 27, 1-26.

Pan, Y., & Tse, D.K. (1996). Cooperative strategies between foreign firms in an overseas country. Journal of International Business Studies, 27, 929-946.

Park, S.H., & Ungson, G.R. (1997). The effect of national culture, organizational complementarity, and economic motivation on joint venture dissolution. Academy of Management Journal, 40, 279-307.

Pearson, V.M.S., & Stephan, W.G. (1998). Preferences for styles of negotiation: A comparison of Brazil and the U.S. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22, 67-83.

Peterson, M.F., and colleagues. (1995). Role conflict, ambiguity, and overload: A 21-nation study. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 429-452.

Peterson, M.F., & Smith, P.B. (1997). Does national culture or ambient temperature explain cross-national differences in role stress? No sweat! Academy of Management Journal, 40, 930-946.

Phalet, K., & Claeys, W. (1993). A comparative study of Turkish and Belgian youth. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24, 319-343.

Pillai, R., & Meindl, J.R. (1998). Context and charisma: A "meso" level examination of the relationship of organic structure, collectivism, and crisis to charismatic leadership. Journal of Management, 24, 643-671.

Podsakoff, P.M., & Organ, D.W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. Journal of Management, 12, 531-544.

Probst, T.M., Carnevale, P.J., & Triandis, H.C. (1999). Cultural values in intergroup and single-group social dilemmas. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77, 171-191.

Punnett, B.J., & Withane, S. (1990). Hofstede's value survey module: To embrace or abandon? Advances in International Comparative Management, 5, 69-89.

Ralston, D.A., Gustafson, D.J., Cheung, F.M., & Terpstra, R.H. (1993). Differences in managerial values: A study of U.S., Honk Kong, and PRC managers. Journal of International Business Studies, 24, 249-275.

Ralston, D.A., Holt, D.H., Terpstra, R.H., & Kaicheng, Y. (1997). The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial work values: A study of the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. Journal of International Business Studies, 28, 177-207.

Ralston, D.A., Egri, C.P., Stewart, S., Terpstra, R.H., & Kaicheng, Y. (1999). Doing business in the 21<sup>st</sup> century with the new generation of Chinese managers: A study of generational shifts in work values in China. Journal of International Business Studies, 30, 415-428.

Ramamoorthy, N., & Carroll, S.J. (1998). Individualism/collectivism orientations and reactions toward alternative human resource management practices. Human Relations, 51, 571-588.

Riahi-Belkaoui, A. (1998). Cultural determinism and systematic risk of global stock exchanges. International Journal of Commerce & Management, 8, 102-108.

Roberts, K., & Boyacigiller, N. (1984). Cross-national organizational research: The grasp of the blind men. Research in Organizational Behavior, 6, 423-475.

Robinson, R.V. (1983). Review of Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Work and Occupations, 10, 110-115.

Robie, C., Ryan, A.M., Schmieder, R.A., Parra, L.F., & Smith, P.C. (1998). The relation between job level and job satisfaction. Group & Organization Management, 23, 470-495.

Roth, M.S. (1995). The effects of culture and socioeconomics on the performance of global brand image strategies. Journal of Marketing Research, 32, 163-175.

Roth, K., & O'Donnell, S. (1996). Foreign subsidiary compensation strategy: An agency theory perspective. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 678-703.

Ryan, A.M., McFarland, L., Baron, H., & Page, R. (1999). An international look at selection practices: Nation and culture as explanations for variability in practice. Personnel Psychology, 52, 359-391.

Salter, S.B., & Niswander, F. (1995). Cultural influence on the development of accounting systems internationally: A test of Gray's (1988) theory. Journal of International Business Studies, 26, 379-397.

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, S.C., & De Meyer, A. (1991). Interpreting and responding to strategic issues: The impact of national culture. Strategic Management Journal, 12, 307-320.

Schuler, R.S., & Rogovsky, N. (1998). Understanding compensation practice variations across firms: The impact of national culture. Journal of International Business Studies, 29, 159-177.

Schwartz, S.H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21, 139-157.

Schwartz, S.H. (1994). Cultural dimensions of values: Towards an understanding of national differences. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theoretical and methodological issues* (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Selmer, J., & DeLeon, C. (1996). Parent cultural control through organizational acculturation: HCN employees learning new work values in foreign business subsidiaries. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17, 557-572.

Shackleton, V.J., & Ali, A.H. (1990). Work-related values of managers: A test of Hofstede's model. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21, 109-118.

Shane, S. (1992). The effect of cultural differences in perceptions of transaction costs on national differences in the preference for licensing. Management International Review, 32, 295-311.

Shane, S. (1994). The effect of national culture on the choice between licensing and direct foreign investment. Strategic Management Journal, *15*, 627-642.

Shane, S. (1995). Uncertainty avoidance and the preference for innovation championing roles. Journal of International Business Studies, *26*, 47-68.

Shane, S., Venkataraman, S., & MacMillan, I. (1995). Cultural differences in innovation championing roles. Journal of Management, *21*, 931-952.

Shenkar, O., & Zeira, Y. (1992). Role conflict and role ambiguity of chief executive officers in international joint ventures. Journal of International Business Studies, *23*, 55-75.

Smith, P.B., & Bond, M.H. (1999). Social psychology across cultures, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Smith, P.B., & Dugan, S. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *27*, 231-264.

Smith, P.B., Dugan, S., Peterson, M.F., & Leung, K. (1998). Individualism-collectivism and the handling of disagreement: A 23 country study. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, *22*, 351-367.

Sondergaard, M. (1994). Hofstede's consequences: A study of reviews, citations, and replications. Organization Studies, *15*, 447-456.

Spence, J.T. (1985). Achievement American style. American Psychologist, *40*, 1285-1295.

Steensma, H.K., Marino, L., Weaver, K.M., & Dickson, P.H. (in press). The influence of national culture on the formation of technology alliances by entrepreneurial firms. Academy of Management Journal.

Stephan, C.W., Stephan, W.G., Saito, I., & Barnett, S.M. (1998). Emotional expression in Japan and the United States: The nonmonolithic nature of individualism and collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *29*, 728-748.

Tafarodi, R.W., Lang, J.M., & Smith, A.J. (1999). Self-esteem and the cultural trade-off: Evidence for the role of individualism-collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *30*, 620-640.

Tahai, A., & Meyer, M.L. (1999). A revealed preference study of management journals' direct influences. Strategic Management Journal, *20*, 279-296.

Terpstra, V., & Yu, C. (1988). Determinants of foreign investment of U.S. advertising agencies. Journal of International Business Studies, *19*, 33-46.

Thomas, D.C. (1999). Cultural diversity and work group effectiveness: An experimental study. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *30*, 242-263.

Tinsley, C.H., & Pillutla, M.M. (1998). Negotiating in the United States and Hong Kong. Journal of International Business Studies, *29*, 71-728.

Tower, R.K., Kelly, C., & Richards, A. (1997). Individualism, collectivism and reward allocation: A cross-cultural study in Russia and Britain. British Journal of Social Psychology, *36*, 331-345.

Triandis, H.C. (1982). Review of Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Human Organization, *41*, 86-90.

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.

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

Trompenaars, F. (1993). Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business. Chicago, IL: Irwin.

Trubinsky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S.L. (1991). The influence of individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, *15*, 65-84.

Vandello, J.A., & Cohen, D. (1999). Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *77*, 279-292.

Van de Ven, A.H., & Ferry, D.L. (1980). Measuring and assessing organizations. New York: Wiley.

Van de Vliert, E., & Van Yperen, N.W. (1996). Why cross-national differences in role overload? Don't overlook ambient temperature! Academy of Management Journal, *39*, 986-1004.

Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M.E., & Cummings, L.L. (2000). Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. Journal of Organizational Behavior, *21*, 3-23.

Wagner, J.A., III (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. Academy of Management Journal, *38*, 152-172.

Williams, K.Y., & O'Reilly, C.A., III. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, vol. 20 (pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.



Wojciszke, B. (1997). Parallels between competence- versus morality-related traits and individualistic versus collectivistic values. European Journal of Social Psychology, *27*, 245-256.

Yamaguchi, S., Kuhlman, D.M., & Sugimori, S. (1995). Personality correlates of allocentric tendencies in individualist and collectivist cultures. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, *26*, 658-672.

Zaheer, S., & Zaheer, A. (1997). Country effects on information seeking in global electronic networks. Journal of International Business Studies, *28*, 77-100.

Author Note

Bradley L. Kirkman, Department of Business Administration, Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Kevin B. Lowe, Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Cristina B. Gibson, Center for Effective Organizations, Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Bradley L. Kirkman, Department of Business Administration, Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, P.O. Box 26165, Greensboro, North Carolina 27402-6165, Phone: (336) 334-3096, Fax: (336) 334-4141, Email: [brad\\_kirkman@uncg.edu](mailto:brad_kirkman@uncg.edu).

Table 1

Journals Searched with Corresponding Number of Articles Found

<b>JOURNAL NAME</b>	<b>Number</b>
Academy of Management Journal	21
Administrative Science Quarterly	5
Advances in International Comparative Management	1
Annual Review of Psychology	0
British Journal of Psychology	0
British Journal of Social Psychology	2
European Journal of Social Psychology	1
Group & Organization Management	1
Human Relations	2
International Journal of Commerce & Management	2
International Journal of Comparative Sociology	0
International Journal of Conflict Management	0
International Journal of Intercultural Relations	5
International Journal of Organizational Analysis	2
International Journal of Psychology	0
International Journal of Management & Organization	0
Journal of Applied Behavioral Science	2
Journal of Applied Psychology	2
Journal of Applied Social Psychology	3
Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology	20
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology	1
Journal of International Business Studies	22
Journal of Management	7
Journal of Management Studies	0
Journal of Organizational Behavior	4
Journal of Personality	0
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	11
Journal of Research in Personality	0
Leadership Quarterly	1
Management International Review	2
Multinational Business Review	0
Organization Science	0
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	2
Personnel Psychology	2
Psychological Bulletin	0
Psychological Review	0
Small Group Research	1
Strategic Management Journal	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>127</b>

Table 2

Classification Scheme Used for Literature Review and Number of Articles Included

	<b>Individual Level</b>	<b>Group Level</b>	<b>Organization Level</b>	<b>Country Level</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Culture as a Direct Effect</b>	49	5	4	42	100
<b>Culture as a Moderator</b>	13	4	4	2	23
<b>Culture as a Criterion Variable</b>	3	0	0	1	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>127</b>

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	James (1993)	50 U.S. undergraduates	Survey responses to reading essay	Individualism-Collectivism, Attitudes toward new technology, information retention	Collectivists showed more positive group attitudes toward new technology and retained more information about it when a presentation contained a group-relevance theme; individualists showed more positive individual attitudes when presentation contained a self-relevance theme.
Individual	Geletkanycz (1997)	1,500 top managers in 20 countries	Survey; Cultural values assessed by country score assignment	All five Hofstede values; Commitment to the status quo regarding organizational leadership and strategy	Managers were more likely to adhere to the status quo regarding organizational leadership and the organization's strategic initiatives when they were individualistic, low in uncertainty avoidance, low in power distance, and had a long-term orientation.
Individual	Anakwe et al. (1999)	424 U.S. undergraduates and graduate students	Survey	Collectivism; receptivity to distance learning technology	Collectivism was negatively related to distance learning technology.
Individual	Eby et al. (2000)	117 employees and managers in a U.S. sales organization	Survey	Collectivism and individual perceptions of organizational readiness to change	Collectivism was positively related to individual perceptions of an organization's readiness to change to team-based selling.
Individual	Leung (1987)	96 undergraduates and 72 non-students in both Hong Kong and U.S.	Scenario-based experiment	Collectivism; negotiation preferences; rationales behind preferences for certain negotiation strategies	Hong Kong subjects were more collectivistic than U.S. subjects; H.K. subjects preferred bargaining and mediation more than U.S. subjects due their beliefs that these strategies helped reduce animosity between disputants.
Individual	Leung (1988)	96 undergraduates and 72 non-students in both Hong Kong and U.S.	Scenario-based experiment	Collectivism; likelihood of suing; stranger versus friend	Hong Kong subjects were more likely to sue a stranger than were U.S. subjects; collectivism was associated with higher likelihood of suing when dispute was between strangers but not between friends.
Individual	Cocroft & Ting-Toomey (1994)	200 undergraduates in both Japan and the U.S.	Experimental dilemma	Individualism; Collectivism; presentation strategies in conflict	Japanese scored higher on both individualism and collectivism; U.S. subjects used more anti-social, self-attribution, hint, and self-presentation strategies than did Japanese subjects who used more indirect face strategies.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Gabrielidis & Stephan (1997)	A total of 200 undergraduates in Mexico and the U.S.	Survey	Individualism; Collectivism; Masculinity-Femininity; styles of conflict resolution	Mexicans were more collectivistic, individualistic, and masculine than U.S. subjects; Mexican scores on accommodation and collaboration were higher than U.S. scores; within Mexico, collectivism was positively correlated with collaboration and masculinity with accommodation and avoidance; in the U.S., collectivism was positively, and individualism negatively, correlated with avoidance.
Individual	Arunachalam et al. (1998)	A total of over 600 undergraduates in Hong Kong and U.S.	Negotiation experiment	Individualism; Collectivism; negotiation outcome quality	Hong Kong subjects were more collectivistic and less individualistic than U.S. subjects; H.K. negotiators obtained higher joint outcomes than U.S. negotiators; negotiators with a high, rather than low, best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA) obtained larger individual outcomes in both countries; mediation had a stronger effect on outcomes in U.S. negotiations.
Individual	Tinsley & Pillutia (1998)	A total of 231 undergraduates in Hong Kong and U.S.	Dyad negotiation experiments	Individualism; Collectivism; problem solving strategies	Hong Kong subjects were more collectivistic and less individualistic than U.S. subjects; U.S. subjects rated self-interested and joint problem solving as more appropriate than Hong Kong subjects.
Individual	Brett & Okumura (1998)	Managers from Japan and U.S. making up 30 intercultural dyads and 65 intracultural dyads	Inter- and intra-cultural dyad negotiation experiments	Individualism; Hierarchy (i.e. power distance); negotiation tactics	U.S. managers were more individualistic but less hierarchical than Japanese managers; individualists endorsed self-interest in negotiations more than collectivists; those with hierarchical values endorsed distributive tactics more; in inter- (rather than intra-) cultural negotiations, significant misunderstandings occurred about negotiator priorities.
Individual	Pearson & Stephan (1998)	A total of 419 undergraduates in Brazil and U.S.	Intracultural dyad negotiation experiments	Individualism; negotiation tactics	Brazilians preferred accommodation, collaboration, and withdrawal tactics more than did U.S. subjects; U.S. subjects preferred competition more than Brazilians; U.S. subjects preferred "high concern for self" tactics while Brazilians preferred "high concern for others" tactics; Brazilians made ingroup-outgroup distinctions while U.S. subjects did not.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Leung & Iwawaki (1988)	A total of 500 undergraduates in Japan, South Korean, and U.S.	Reward allocation experiment	Collectivism; allocator generosity; equity versus equality norms; low versus high inputs; friends versus strangers	Japanese and U.S. subjects did not differ on collectivism; generous allocators were better liked in all three countries and were rated as fairer than less generous allocators in Japan and the U.S.; low-input Japanese and Korean subjects did not follow the equity norm more closely than did U.S. subjects nor did they allocate more equally with friends and more equitably with strangers; collectivism was positively related to the use of the equality rule and negatively to the use of the equity rule.
Individual	Hui et al. (1991)	A total of 160 undergraduates in Hong Kong and U.S.	Reward allocation experiment	Collectivism; allocator generosity; equity versus equality norms; friends versus strangers plentiful versus fixed resource amounts	Hong Kong subjects were more collectivistic than U.S. subjects; when resources were plentiful, Hong Kong subjects put greater emphasis on equal allocation than U.S. subjects; when resources were fixed, Hong Kong subjects were more generous than U.S. subjects and differentiated between close friends and co-workers.
Individual	Mann et al. (1985)	A total of over 300 primary schoolchildren in Australia and Japan	Hypothetical and actual game experiments	Collectivism; reward allocation decision rules	Japanese subjects were more collectivistic than Australian subjects; Japanese subjects were more likely to follow “equal-say” rules while Australians used more “self-interest” rules in actual game experiments.
Individual	Tower et al. (1997)	80 students each in England and Russia	Reward allocation experiment	Collectivism; allocator generosity; equity versus equality norms; low versus high inputs; friends versus strangers	Russian subjects were more collectivistic than English subjects; English subjects allocated more reward to themselves than did Russians; English low performers allocated more to themselves than did Russian low performers; Russians were more generous when their co-worker was a friend while Russian high performers allocated more to themselves when their co-worker was a stranger; friendship status was irrelevant to British subjects.
Individual	Chen et al. (1997)	300 managers in the PRC	In-basket exercise	Horizontal collectivism; Vertical collectivism; reward allocation reform	Vertical collectivism was positively related to reward allocation reform; horizontal collectivism was negatively related to reward allocation reform and differential allocation preferences (but only under the condition of low vertical collectivism).

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Chen et al. (1998)	A total of 241 undergraduates in Hong Kong and U.S.	Reward allocation experiment	Collectivism; equity versus equality norms; task interdependence; goals; achievement motivation	In both countries, reward allocation was more differential when task interdependence was low, rather than high, and when the goal was productivity or fairness rather than solidarity; collectivism was negatively related to reward differential in Hong Kong but not in the U.S.; in both countries, achievement motivation was negatively related to differential allocation when task interdependence was high, however, when task interdependence was low, achievement motivation was positively related to differential allocation in the U.S. (but stays negative for Hong Kong).
Individual	McClean-Parks et al. (1999)	A total of 63 MBAs in Singapore and the U.S.	Experiment	Individualism; resource allocation; resource recovery; time duration of allocation and recovery; equity versus equality norms	U.S. subjects were, on average, more individualistic than Singaporean subjects; individualists took more time to recover resources than collectivists while the opposite was true to resource allocation; in both cultures, equity rules were used more often when allocating a resource while equality rules were used more often when recovering.
Individual	Brockner et al. (2000)	89 managers in Taiwan and Canada; 96 graduate students in the PRC; 74 U.S. American MBA students; 86 U.S. MBA students from 20 cultural backgrounds	Negotiation experiments	Individualism-collectivism (independent-interdependent self-construal); procedural fairness; outcome favorability; reactions to a decision	When procedural fairness was high, outcome favorability had much less of an impact on reactions to a decision in Taiwan than in Canada; U.S. subjects had higher independent self-construal than PRC subjects and the tendency for high procedural fairness to reduce the relationship between outcome favorability and desire for future dealings with negotiation partner was stronger in the PRC than in the U.S.
Individual	Gomez et al. (in press)	A total of 330 MBA students in Mexico and U.S.	Scenario-based experiment	Collectivism; evaluation generosity; ingroup-outgroup distinction; task and maintenance inputs	Mexicans were more collectivistic than U.S. Americans; Collectivists gave more generous evaluations to ingroup, rather than outgroup, members; individualists valued task inputs in determining evaluations than collectivists.
Individual	Ali (1993)	117 managers in Saudi Arabia	Survey	Individualism; decision making styles	Individualism was positively related to consultative, participative, and autocratic decision making styles and attitudes toward risk.



Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Nooteboom et al. (1997)	97 firm-supplier alliances in the Netherlands	Survey	Uncertainty avoidance; perceived probability of potential loss by transaction partners	Uncertainty avoidance was negatively related to the probability of a potential loss by transaction partners but unrelated to the actual size of loss.
Individual	Mitchell et al. (in press)	677 business professionals and new venture creators in Canada, the U.S., Mexico, China, Japan, Australia, and Chile	Survey; country scores on Hofstede's dimensions	Individualism; Power Distance; willingness scripts; ability scripts; arrangements scripts; new venture creation decisions	Individualism and power distance were positively related to "ability" scripts (i.e., given resources, the person is able to carry out goal); individualism was positively related to "willingness" scripts (i.e., given resources, the person will want to carry out goal); and the relationship between "arrangements" scripts (i.e., access to required materials) and the venture creation decision was stronger for individualists rather than collectivists.
Individual	Ozawa et al. (1996)	58 Japanese and 53 U.S. undergraduates	Survey	Individualism (self-construal); change to an affirmative action program	U.S. subjects were more individualistic than Japanese; U.S. subjects perceived a change to affirmative action less favorably and as less fair than Japanese subjects.
Individual	Cable & Judge (1994)	171 U.S. undergraduates	Experiment	Collectivism; preferences for individual-based pay	Collectivism was negatively related to preferences for individual-based pay.
Individual	Ramamoorthy & Carroll (1998)	342 U.S. undergraduates	Survey	Collectivism; need for achievement; need for security; human resource practice preferences	Controlling for need for achievement and security, collectivism was negatively related to use of selection tests, formal appraisal practices, and desire for promotions based on merit and positively related to preference for equality based rewards and employment security.
Individual	Earley (1986)	36 managerial trainees in both England and U.S.	Experiment	Collectivism; Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity-Femininity; positive and negative feedback; individual performance; importance of feedback; trust in supervisor	English subjects scored higher on collectivism and power distance; U.S. subjects performance increased as a result of both positive and negative feedback, whereas English subjects' performance improved only as a result of positive feedback; importance of feedback and trust in supervisor partially mediated the direct effects of positive and negative feedback and culture on performance.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Earley et al. (1999)	228 managerial trainees in the Czech Republic, the PRC, and U.S.	Managerial simulation	Individualism-collectivism; individual and group level feedback; self-efficacy; individual-based performance beliefs; and satisfaction with performance	U.S. subjects were more individualistic than either the Czech or PRC subjects (who did not differ); collectivism was positively related to individual-based performance beliefs and satisfaction; collectivists had their highest efficacy in the combination of high group and high individual performance information; individual feedback was important for both groups but group feedback only for collectivists.
Individual	Triandis et al. (1988)	300 U.S. undergraduates	Survey	Individualism	A measure of individualism was factor analyzed and generated six dimensions: more concern for one's own goals than the ingroup's goals; less attention to the views of ingroups; self-reliance with competition; detachment from ingroups; deciding on one's own rather than asking for the views of others; and less general concern for the ingroup.
	<i>Study 1</i>				
	<i>Study 2</i>	353 student and non-student subjects in Japan, Puerto Rico, and U.S.	Survey	Collectivism; conformity; ingroup influence; concern for ingroup members; extent of subordination of own needs	Contrary to expectations, conventional attitudes associated with collectivists (e.g., they conform more, they see themselves as always under the influence of ingroups, they show more concern for their ingroup members, and they subordinate their needs to their ingroups) were not true of Japanese of Puerto Rican respondents.
	<i>Study 3</i>	100 subjects each in Puerto Rico and U.S.	Survey	Collectivism; social support; loneliness; competition; ingroup versus outgroup	In both countries, collectivism correlated positively with social support and negatively with loneliness; U.S. respondents see competition as occurring between individuals while Puerto Rican respondents view competition as occurring more between ingroups and outgroups.
Individual	Oyserman (1993)	A total of 1,021 undergraduates of various religious backgrounds in Israel	Survey	Individualism; Collectivism; focus on private or public aspects of self; self-concept; centrality of social identities to self-definition; perceptions of intergroup conflict	Individualism was positively related to focusing on private aspects of the self and conceptualizing the self in terms of distinctions between the self and others; collectivism (and individualism) was positively related to centrality of social identities to self-definition, a focus on public aspects of the self, and heightened perception of intergroup conflict.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Eby & Dobbins (1997)	148 U.S. undergraduates	Survey	Collectivism; self-efficacy for teamwork; need for social approval; positive past experience working in teams	Collectivism was positively related to self-efficacy for teamwork, need for social approval, and positive past experiences working in teams.
Individual	Oyserman et al. (1998)	93 Jewish American and 80 Asian and Asian American undergraduates	Survey	Collectivism; Individualism; social obligation; cultural identity; personal goal importance	Collectivism was positively associated with social obligation; individualism reduced social obligation when participants' cultural identity was salient and when social obligation competed with important personal goals; collectivism increased obligation to ingroups when cultural identity was salient.
Individual	Thomas (1999)	77 undergraduates from 14 countries in New Zealand	Experiment	Collectivism; assessments of group processes; group receptiveness; cultural distance	Collectivism was positively related to participants' positive assessments of group process but not to receptiveness; participants' cultural distance on collectivism was positively related to group receptiveness but not to assessments of group process.
Individual	Kirkman & Shapiro (2000a)	618 line-level employees in an insurance company	Survey	Collectivism; receptivity to team-based rewards	Collectivism was positively related to receptivity to team-based rewards.
Individual	Kirkman & Shapiro (in press)	491 self-managing team employees in Belgium, Finland, the Philippines and the U.S.	Survey	Collectivism; Power Distance; job satisfaction; organizational commitment; resistance to teams and self-management	Resistance to teams fully mediated the relationship that collectivism had with both job satisfaction and organizational commitment; resistance to self-management partially mediated the relationship between power distance and organizational commitment.
Individual	Casimir & Keats (1996)	A total of 120 Anglo- and Chinese-Australian middle managers	Survey	Individualism-collectivism; preferences for leadership style	Anglo- and Chinese-Australians did not differ on individualism-collectivism; respondents in both cultures preferred leaders who expressed high concern for both performance and group relations.
Individual	Pillai & Meindl (1998)	463 subordinates and 133 supervisors in the U.S.	Survey	Collectivism; charismatic leadership; work unit performance; job satisfaction; leader effectiveness	Collectivism was positively associated with the level of charismatic leadership which was, in turn, associated with higher supervisory ratings of work unit performance, job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, and leader effectiveness.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Helgstrand & Stuhlmacher (1999)	167 high school students in Denmark and the U.S.	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; leadership preferences	Danish and U.S. subjects differed only on power distance (Danes lower); respondents in both countries rated leaders who were both feminine and individualistic as most effective.
Individual	Moorman & Blakely (1995)	155 employees in a financial services organization	Survey	Collectivism (values, norms, beliefs); organizational citizenship behavior	Collectivism was positively related to multiple dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior when controlling for procedural justice.
Individual	Van Dyne et al. (2000)	183 matched-pair responses of cooperative housing residents in the U.S.	Survey	Collectivism; organizational citizenship behavior; organization-based self-esteem	Collectivism was positively related to organizational citizenship behavior but organization-based self-esteem fully mediated this relationship.
Individual	Hui & Villareal (1989)	49 and 160 undergraduates in Hong Kong and the U.S., respectively	Survey	Collectivism; Individualism; preference for autonomy, deference, affiliation, succorance, and nurturance; need for heterosexuality and abasement; social recognition	In both countries, collectivism was positively related to preferences for affiliation, succorance, and nurturance. In Hong Kong, collectivism was negatively related to preference for autonomy, deference, and need for heterosexuality. In the U.S., individualism was positively related to a high need for social recognition and a low need for abasement.
Individual	Yamaguchi & Kuhlman (1995)	A total of 929 undergraduates in Japan, South Korea, and the U.S.	Survey	Collectivism; affiliative tendency; sensitivity to rejection; need for uniqueness	In all three countries, collectivism was positively related to affiliative tendency and sensitivity to rejection and negatively related to need for uniqueness.
Individual	Wojciszke (1997)	89 undergraduate students in Poland	Survey	Rokeach Value Survey	The eight individualistic values on the survey were more strongly related to ratings of competence than to morality and were more strongly related to ratings of self-profitability than other-profitability (an opposite pattern emerged for the eight collectivistic values).

Table 3

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

Level of Analysis	Author(s)	Countries/ Sample	Method	Variables	Key Findings
Individual	Grimm et al. (1999)	A total of 1286 undergraduates and high school students in the Philippines and the U.S.	Survey	Individualism; valence; agreeableness; conscientiousness; civility; refinement; gregariousness	Filipinos and U.S. respondents did not differ on individualism; in the U.S., individualism was negatively correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, civility, and refinement; in the Philippines, individualism was negatively correlated with gregariousness.
Individual	Tafarodi et al. (1999)	94 British and 92 Malaysian undergraduates in Wales	Survey	Individualism-collectivism; self-esteem	Factor analyzed four dimensions of individualism-collectivism: deference to the direction of relatives, connectedness to parents, confiding in others, and instrumental interdependence; in both countries, "deference" and "connectedness" dimensions were positively related to the self-liking dimension of self-esteem but negatively to the self-competence dimension.
Individual	Bochner & Hesketh (1994)	263 Australian bank employees representing 28 nationalities	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; contact with co-workers; knowledge of staff; extent of working alone; openness and contact with superiors; task-orientation; beliefs in Theory X	Collectivists reported having more informal contact with fellow workers, knew staff better, and were more likely to work on a team rather than work alone than were individualists; High power distance respondents were less open with superiors, had more contact with them, described their supervision as being more close and direct, were more task-oriented, and had greater beliefs in Theory X management than those low in power distance.
Individual	Bennett (1999)	64 U.S. and 47 PRC employees	Survey	All five dimensions of Hofstede's cultural values; work-related attitudes and beliefs	In both countries, collectivism was positively related to favorable attitudes towards group activities and cooperation; in the U.S., masculinity was negatively related to positive attitudes toward human development.
Individual	Clugston et al. (2000)	156 employees in a public agency	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; affective, normative, and continuance commitment to organization, supervisor and work group	Collectivism was positively related to affective commitment to supervisors and work groups, continuance commitment to work groups, and normative commitment to all foci; power distance was positively related to affective commitment to organizations and both continuance and normative commitment to all foci; uncertainty avoidance was positively related to affective commitment to organizations and continuance commitment to all foci.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Group	Cox et al. (1991)	136 undergraduates in 17 ethnically diverse groups and 16 all Anglo groups	Experiment	Collectivism; cooperative behavior	Ethnically diverse groups (i.e., those higher in collectivism) behaved more cooperatively than all Anglo groups (i.e., those lower in collectivism). These differences increased when situational cues favored cooperation.
Group	Eby & Dobbins (1997)	148 undergraduate students in 33 teams	Computer-simulated strategy game	Collectivism; team cooperation; team performance	Team collectivistic orientation was positively related to team cooperation, mediated the relationship between collectivism and team performance.
Group	Kirkman & Shapiro (2000b)	491 employees in 81 self-managing teams	Survey	Collectivism; resistance to teams; team cooperation, empowerment, and productivity	Resistance to teams mediated the positive relationships that collectivism had with team cooperation, empowerment, and productivity.
Group	Oetzel (1998)	10 European-American groups and 10 Japanese-American groups	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; cooperation; competition; conflict	The more individualistic European-American groups had a greater number of conflicts, fewer cooperating tactics, and more competing tactics than the more collectivistic Japanese-American groups.
Group	Pillai & Meindl (1998)	101 intact work groups	Survey	Collectivism; charismatic leadership	Work group collectivism was positively associated with the emergence of charismatic leadership.
Group	Elron (1997)	121 intact top management teams in different subsidiaries	Survey	Country scores on Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity-Femininity; team performance; subsidiary performance; issue-based conflict	Overall top management team heterogeneity on culture was positively related to team performance and issue-based conflict; issue based conflict was, in turn, negatively related to team performance; heterogeneity on both individualism-collectivism and masculinity-femininity was positively related to team performance; heterogeneity in uncertainty avoidance was positively related to issue-based conflict.
Organization	Morris et al. (1993)	84 manufacturing firms in the U.S.	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; firm-level entrepreneurial behavior	Individualism-collectivism had a curvilinear relationship with entrepreneurial behavior such that at either extreme, entrepreneurial behavior suffers.

Table 3

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

Level of Analysis	Countries/		Method	Variables	Key Findings
	Author(s)	Sample			
Organization	Morris et al. (1994)	252 senior marketing executives from 84 U.S. manufacturing firms	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; firm-level entrepreneurial behavior	Individualism-collectivism had a curvilinear relationship with entrepreneurial behavior such that at either extreme, entrepreneurial behavior suffers. Found in South African data but not in Portuguese data.
Organization	Newman & Nollen (1996)	176 European and Asian work units of a U.S. multinational located in 18 countries	Survey	Country scores on Individualism-Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity-Femininity	When managers fit their organizational practices to the values of a country's culture, their units had higher returns on assets, higher returns on sales, and in some cases higher bonus levels than units in which a fit was lacking.
Organization	Steensma et al. (in press)	494 manufacturing firms in Australia, Indonesia, Norway, and Sweden	Survey	Individualism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance; propensity of firm-to-firm cooperation for technology innovation alliances	Firms in more masculine cultures are less likely to pursue technology alliances than are firms in more feminine cultures; firms in more individualistic cultures are less likely to pursue equity ties in their alliance formation than are firms in more collectivistic cultures.
Country	Kogut & Singh (1988)	Data on U.S. joint ventures, acquisitions, and Greenfield from 1981 to 1985	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; investment strategy choice	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, the tendency to choose a joint venture over an acquisition increases; the level of uncertainty avoidance in the home country was positively related to the tendency to use joint ventures over greenfields or acquisitions.
Country	Li & Guisinger (1992)	Published data on 158 large service multinational enterprises (MNEs) from 1976-1980 and 168 MNEs from 1980-1986(U.S., Canada, Japan, Western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand)	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; U.S. foreign direct investment	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, the amount of U.S. foreign direct investment decreases.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Country	Loree & Guisinger (1995)	U.S. Department of Commerce's <i>Benchmark Surveys</i> in 1977 and 1982	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; U.S. foreign direct investment	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, the amount of U.S. foreign direct investment decreases.
Country	Datta & Puia (1995)	Completed U.S. cross-border acquisitions between 1978 and 1990	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; shareholder wealth	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, shareholder wealth in those firms making cross-border acquisitions decreases as a result of the acquisition.
Country	Roth & O'Donnell (1996)	Senior managers from 100 foreign subsidiaries from multiple countries	Survey	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; proportion of incentive-based compensation	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, a greater proportion of incentive-based compensation was used for subsidiary managers of host-country foreign affiliates.
Country	Pan (1996)	4223 international equity joint ventures originating in the PRC from 1979 to 1992	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; ownership shares	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, equity joint venture partners are more likely to acquire an equal or majority share, rather than a minority share.
Country	Barkema et al. (1996)	Foreign expansions of 13 large non-financial Dutch firms between 1966 and 1988	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; foreign venture longevity	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, foreign venture longevity decreases.
Country	Barkema et al. (1997)	International joint ventures in 25 large Dutch firms from 1966 to 1994	Survey	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; foreign joint venture longevity	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, foreign joint venture longevity decreases.



Table 3

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

Level of Analysis	Author(s)	Countries/ Sample	Method	Variables	Key Findings
Country	Kashlak et al. (1998)	Alliances and contracts in the telecommunications industry from 1982 to 1993	Survey	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; structural changes in alliances and contracts	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, greater structural changes in alliances and contracts take place.
Country	Hennart & Larimo (1998)	28 joint ventures between two Japanese firms and 10 between two Finnish firms	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; preferences for ownership	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, shared-equity ventures are preferred over wholly-owned subsidiaries.
Country	Luo & Peng (1999)	108 upper managers of MNE subunits in the PRC	Survey	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; international expansion performance	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, international expansion performance decreases.
Country	Benito & Gripsrud (1992)	Norwegian companies foreign direct investments in manufacturing in 1970s until 1982	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; foreign direct investment location decisions	There was no effect of overall cultural distance on initial or subsequent foreign direct investment decisions.
Country	Terpstra & Yu (1988)	Foreign investment decisions of top twenty largest U.S. advertising agencies in 1972 and 1984	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; type of cooperative arrangements for firms across borders	There was no effect of overall cultural distance on the type of cooperative arrangements firms across borders prefer.
Country	Pan & Tse (1996)	Cooperative firm arrangements in China by outside countries from 1979 to 1993	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; type of cooperative arrangements for firms across borders	There was no effect of overall cultural distance on the type of cooperative arrangements firms across borders prefer.

Table 3

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

Level of Analysis	Countries/ Sample	Method	Variables	Key Findings
Country	Author(s) Brouthers & Brouthers (2000)	Archival	Overall cultural distance based on country scores from Hofstede; country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; choice between acquisitions or greenfields	There was no effect of overall cultural distance on the choice between acquisitions or greenfields; uncertainty avoidance was positively related to preference for greenfield startup ventures rather than acquisitions.
Country	Gomez-Mejia & Palich (1997)	Archival	Culturally related international diversification in Fortune 500 firms	There was no effect of overall cultural distance on firm performance.
Country	Park & Ungson (1997)	Archival	137 cross-border joint ventures and 49 domestic (U.S.-U.S.) joint ventures	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, the rate of joint venture dissolution decreases.
Country	Morosini et al. (1998)	Survey	52 companies that had engaged in cross-border activity with Italy between 1987 and 1992	As the overall cultural distance between countries increases, the performance of cross-border acquisitions increases.
Country	Shenkar & Zeira (1992)	Survey	44 international joint ventures originating in Israel between 1985 and 1987	Specific cultural distance scores on individualism-collectivism and uncertainty avoidance were negatively related to CEO role ambiguity while overall cultural distance was not related.
Country	Barkema & Vermeulen (1997)	Archival data from 1966 to 1994	25 Dutch companies engaged in international joint ventures	Overall cultural distance was negatively related to the survival rate of international joint ventures; cultural distance scores on uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation (and, to a lesser extent, masculinity) had negative effects on survival rate of joint ventures (individualism and power distance were unrelated); effects of cultural distance was stable over time.

Table 3

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

Level of Analysis	Country	Author(s)	Countries/ Sample	Method	Variables	Key Findings
Country		Shane (1992)	Over 100 manufacturing industries investing in 33 countries	Archival data on licensing and foreign direct investment from 1977 to 1986	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; preferences for foreign direct investment versus licensing; overall cultural distance	While controlling for overall cultural distance, power distance was positively related to preferences for foreign direct investment over licensing; overall cultural distance was related to less licensing and more foreign direct investment.
Country		Shane (1994)	Licensing and foreign direct investment from over 100 manufacturing industries investing in 50 countries in 1977 and 1982	Archival	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; preferences for foreign direct investment versus licensing; overall cultural distance	While controlling for overall cultural distance, licensing is preferred in countries in which trust is greater (i.e., countries low in power distance).
Country		Erramilli (1996)	337 subsidiaries belonging to U.S. and European advertising firms	Archival	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; level of ownership in foreign subsidiaries; overall cultural distance	While controlling for overall cultural distance, the greater the power distance and uncertainty characterizing a firm's home country, the more that firm sought majority ownership in foreign subsidiaries; overall cultural distance was not related.
Country		Franke et al. (1991)	Data from 18 countries common to Hofstede (1980) and the Chinese Culture Connection (1987)	Archival	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; economic growth	Confucian dynamism was a strong predictor of economic growth for the periods 1965-1980 and 1980-1987; individualism was also a strong negative predictor of growth but only for the first time period.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Country	Smith et al. (1998)	Managers in 23 countries	Survey	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; conflict management style	Level of power distance was negatively related to the frequency of out-group disagreements; within collectivistic countries, disagreements were more frequently handled through reliance on rules rather than personal experience or training; with low power distance nations, ingroup disagreements were handled more frequently through reliance on subordinates while out-group disagreements were more frequently handled through reliance on peers.
Country	Morris et al. (1998)	A total of 454 MBA students in China, India, the Philippines, and the U.S.	Survey	Conflict management styles	Chinese managers rely more on an avoiding style due to their high value on conformity and tradition, while U.S. managers rely more on a competing style due to their high value on individualism.
Country	Schuler & Rogovsky (1998)	Worldwide compensation data	Survey-archival	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; compensation preferences	Individualism was positively related to the use of pay-for-performance and a focus on individual performance, social benefits such as child care and career breaks, and employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs); power distance was negatively related to social benefits and ESOPs; uncertainty avoidance was positively related to seniority- and skill-based pay plans and ESOPs and negatively related to a focus on individual performance; masculinity was positively related to individual bonuses and commissions, career breaks, and maternity leave and negatively related to flexible benefits and workplace childcare.

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Country	Ryan et al. (1999)	Managers in over 1000 companies in 20 countries	Survey	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; employee selection practices	As the level of uncertainty avoidance increased, the number used and extent of verification methods in selection practices decreased but the number of test types, extent of testing, number of interviews, use of a fixed list of interviews, and the number of selection process auditing methods increased; as power distance increased, the overall number of interviews used in selection and peer involvement increased while the use of peers as interviewers decreased. As the level of uncertainty avoidance increased, preferences for champions to work through organizational norms, rules, and procedures to promote innovation increased; higher power distance levels were associated with an increased preference for champions to focus on gaining support from those in authority; more collectivistic societies preferred champions to seek cross-functional support for their ideas.
Country	Shane et al. (1995)	Over 1000 employees in 30 countries	Survey	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; innovation championing strategies	Lower levels of uncertainty avoidance were associated with preferences for four innovating championing roles: the organizational maverick, the network facilitator, the transformational leader, and the organizational buffer. Power distance was negatively related to leader communication, approachability, delegation, and team building; uncertainty avoidance was positively associated with leader control and negatively associated with delegation and approachability. Collectivism was positively associated with team-oriented leadership and both power distance and uncertainty avoidance were negatively associated with participative leadership.
Country	Shane (1995)	Over 4000 employees in 68 countries	Survey	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; innovation championing roles	Individualism was positively correlated with national wealth but negatively with cultural heterogeneity.
Country	Offerman & Hellmann (1997)	Over 400 middle managers of a single multinational representing 39 nationalities	Survey	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; leadership practices and behaviors	
Country	House et al. (1999)	Middle managers in 54 countries	Survey	Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance	
Country	Diener & Diener (1995)	Over 13,000 undergraduates in 31 countries	Survey and archival	Individualism-Collectivism; wealth; cultural heterogeneity	

Table 3

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

Level of Analysis	Countries/			Method	Variables	Key Findings
	Author(s)	Sample	Sample			
Country	Husted (1999)	40 countries	Archival	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; corruption	Power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity were positively related to national levels of corruption.	
Country	Diener et al. (1995)	Over 120,000 undergraduate students in 55 countries	Survey	Individualism-collectivism; wealth; human rights; growth of wealth; income social comparison; equality; cultural heterogeneity	After controlling for income, human rights, social equality, and heterogeneity, only individualism was positively related to the subjective well being of nations.	
Country	Salter & Niswander (1995)	Stock market data and accounting values from 29 countries in 1989 and 1990	Archival	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; accounting values	Uncertainty avoidance was negatively related to the use of professional accounting standards (i.e., prescriptive legal requirements, statutory control) and positively related to uniformity (i.e., whether a country's legal system is code law based and therefore uniform), conservatism (i.e., systems designed to stop financial reporting that increases income or assets), and secrecy (i.e., preference for confidentiality and non-disclosure of information). Masculinity was positively related to uniformity of accounting principles in practice and negatively related to conservatism. Individualism was also negatively related to secrecy.	
Country	Peterson et al. (1995)	Over 2,500 managers in 21 countries	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; role ambiguity; role overload	High power distance and low individualism were positively related to high levels of role overload and low levels role ambiguity after controlling for demographic and organizational factors.	
Country	Van de Vliert & Van Yperen (1996)	21 countries	Survey and archival	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; role ambiguity; role overload; ambient temperature	Average daytime temperature for a country's capital was positively related to role overload while power distance was not related.	

Table 3

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Direct Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Country	Peterson & Smith (1997)	32 countries	Survey and archival	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; role ambiguity; role overload; ambient temperature	Power distance is the stronger predictor of role overload and role ambiguity even when the ambient temperature of the city in which the data collection took place was accounted for.
Country	Schneider & DeMeyer (1991)	303 MBA student and executives	Survey responses based on reading case	Country clusters based on Hofstede's country scores; reactions to crisis in a case	Latin Europeans were most likely to interpret the issue in the case as a crisis and as a threat.
Country	Zaheer & Zaheer (1997)	25 countries	Archival	Country clusters based on Hofstede's country scores; information seeking in networks	Countries high in individualism exhibited lower levels of information seeking in their networks.
Country	Riahi-Belkaoui (1998)	16 countries	Archival	Country scores on Hofstede's cultural value dimensions; systematic risk in stock exchanges	Individualism and power distance were positively related to a country's systematic risk in its stock exchange while uncertainty avoidance was negatively related to systematic risk.

Table 4

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Moderating Effect

Level of Analysis	Countries/		Method	Variables	Key Findings
	Author(s)	Sample			
Individual	Erez & Earley (1987)	180 undergraduates from the U.S., urban Israel; kibbutzim Israel	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; goal acceptance; performance; goal strategies	Goal acceptance decreased in both assigned goal and representative conditions; representative and participative goal setting enhanced performance, but the effects were stronger in Israeli samples (high power distance) versus U.S. samples (low power distance). For individuals with high socialization (i.e., strong beliefs in the key cultural values of a society), directive leadership had stronger relationships to outcomes compared to those low in socialization; the effects of contingent reward leadership behaviors remained invariant regardless of cultural socialization.
Individual	Dorfman & Howell (1988)	A total of 752 Mexican, Taiwanese, and U.S. managers working Mexico and Taiwan	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; leader behavior; subordinate performance and satisfaction	Self-focused training had a stronger impact on self-efficacy and performance for individualistic U.S. subjects while group-focused training had stronger effects for collectivists.
Individual	Earley (1994)	A total of 251 managers in Hong Kong, the PRC, and the U.S.	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; self-focused versus group-focused training; self-efficacy; performance	Participants from high and low power distance countries were more or less satisfied with their job in empowered and disempowered work conditions, respectively; participants from high power distance countries did not perform as well when empowered as when disempowered.
Individual	Eylon & Au (1999)	135 mixed origin MBAs in Canada	In-basket simulation	Power Distance; empowerment; job satisfaction; performance	The relationship between voice and procedural fairness judgments was equally strong across cultures regardless of power distance levels.
Individual	Lind et al. (1997)	Over 1000 undergraduates from Germany, Hong Kong, Japan, and the U.S.	Experiment	Power distance; voice; procedural fairness perceptions	



Table 4

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Moderating Effect

Level of Analysis	Countries/		Method	Variables	Key Findings
	Author(s)	Sample			
Individual	Brockner et al. (in press)	254 MBA students in the PRC and the U.S.; 297 business students in Mexico and the U.S.; 450 undergraduate students in Hong Kong and Germany; 102 managers and 253 employees in the PRC	Experiment	Power distance; voice; procedural fairness perceptions; organizational commitment	Participants were more likely to respond unfavorably (i.e., with lower levels of commitment) to low levels of voice in lower power distance countries than in higher power distance countries.
Individual	Earley (1989)	A total of 96 managerial trainees in the PRC and U.S.	Experiment	Collectivism; performance; individual versus shared responsibility; high versus low accountability	Highly individualistic people performed poorest under conditions of high shared responsibility and low accountability; highly collectivistic people performed better under conditions of high shared responsibility, regardless of accountability.
Individual	Earley (1993)	A total of 165 managers from the PRC, Israel, and the U.S.	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; performance; ingroup versus outgroup; social loafing; self and group efficacy beliefs	The performance of individualists who thought they were working in an ingroup or an outgroup was lower than the performance of individualists working alone; the performance of collectivists was lower in an individual or outgroup context than in an ingroup context; participant ratings of self or group efficacy and their anticipated performance outcomes mediated the effects of individualism-collectivism on performance.
Individual	Wagner (1995)	492 undergraduates in the U.S.	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; group size; individuals' identifiability; sense of shared responsibility; peer-rated cooperation	Small group size, high identifiability, and low shared responsibility were associated with greater cooperation in groups; group size and identifiability have stronger effects on the cooperation of individualists than they do collectivists.
Individual	Chen et al. (1998)	A total of almost 400 undergraduates from the PRC and the U.S.	Experiment	Collective primacy orientation; ingroup favoritism; performance	Participants from the PRC had more of a collective primacy than U.S. subjects, and the PRC subjects exhibited more ingroup favoritism when they performed well individually while their group performed poorly.

Table 4

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Moderating Effect

Level of Analysis	Author(s)	Countries/ Sample	Method	Variables	Key Findings
Individual	Gelfand & Realo (1999)	102 Caucasian and Asian American undergraduates in the U.S. and 109 in Estonia	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; negotiator accountability; psychological states, behaviors, and outcomes	In high accountability negotiations, the more collectivistic the dyad, the higher the level of: willingness to concede, cooperative behavior, and profit from the negotiation; in low accountability negotiations, opposite findings emerged.
Individual	Probst et al. (1999)	165 U.S. undergraduates	Experiment	Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism; cooperation; single group and intergroup dilemma	Vertical individualists were least cooperative in the single-group dilemma but were more cooperative in the intergroup dilemma; vertical collectivists were most cooperative in the single group dilemma but were less cooperative in the intergroup dilemma.
Individual	Jung & Avolio (1999)	A total of 347 Asian and U.S. undergraduates	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; transactional versus transformational leadership; number of ideas generated	Collectivists generated more ideas working with a transformational leader rather than transactional; individualists generated more ideas with a transactional versus transformational; in general, group performance was greater than that of subjects working alone.
Group	Palich et al. (1995)	Almost 2,000 managers in 15 European and Canadian affiliates of a U.S. multinational	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; job scope; participative management; extrinsic rewards; role clarity; organizational commitment	There was no support for the hypothesized moderating effects of the cultural values on the relationships between U.S.-based predictors of organizational commitment and commitment in foreign affiliates; individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity had direct effects on organizational commitment but explained only 2.7% of the variance.
Group	Erez & Somech (1996)	122 managers from Israeli kibbutzim and urban cities	Experiment	Individualism-Collectivism; group performance; group goals; group incentives	Group performance loss was less likely in collectivistic versus individualistic groups; the highest level of group performance occurred in the collectivist groups with a group goal and group incentives.
Group	Gibson (1999)	294 undergraduate students in the U.S. and Hong Kong and 185 nurses in the U.S. and Indonesia	Experiment and field survey	Collectivism; group efficacy; group performance	Group efficacy and group performance were positively related when collectivism was high, but not when it was low.

Table 4

## Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Moderating Effect

Level of Analysis Group	Author(s)	Countries/		Method	Variables	Key Findings
		Sample				
Organization	Earley (1999)	Almost 300 managerial trainees from England, France, Thailand, and U.S.		Experiment	Power Distance; group member status; individual estimates of group efficacy; collective estimates of group efficacy	In high power distance cultures, collective judgments of group efficacy were more strongly tied to higher, rather than lower, status group members' personal judgments; in low power distance cultures, group members contributed comparably to group efficacy judgments. Cooperative subjects working in collectivistic cultures were rated by coworkers as the most cooperative, they reported working with the greatest number of people, and they had the strongest preferences for evaluating work performance on the basis of team contributions rather than individual performance.
Organization	Chatman & Barsade (1995)	139 MBA students in the U.S.		Experiment	Individualistic-Collectivistic organizational cultures; cooperation	Cooperative subjects working in collectivistic cultures were rated by coworkers as the most cooperative, they reported working with the greatest number of people, and they had the strongest preferences for evaluating work performance on the basis of team contributions rather than individual performance.
Organization	Chatman et al. (1998)	258 MBA students in the U.S.		Experiment	Individualistic-Collectivistic organizational cultures; social interaction; conflict; productivity; creativity	An emphasis on collectivism led to a greater increase in communication among diverse members rather than demographically homogeneous members; more conflict was found in individualistic versus collectivistic cultures but collectivists viewed conflict as more beneficial; as demographic similarity decreased, subjects in collectivistic cultures perceived themselves as more creative than those in individualistic cultures; similar people were more productive in individualistic rather than collectivistic cultures, while dissimilar people were equally productive across the two cultures.
Organization	Dickson & Weaver (1997)	Top managers in 433 Norwegian manufacturing firms		Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; perceived uncertainty; inter-firm alliance use	The increase in the odds of using alliances as a result of perceived uncertainty was greater for collectivistic managers compared to individualistic managers.
Organization	Steensma et al. (in press)	494 manufacturing firms in Australia, Indonesia, Norway, and Sweden		Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; Power Distance; Uncertainty-Avoidance; Masculinity-Femininity; perceived technological uncertainty; use of technology alliances	The relationship between perceived technological uncertainty and the use of technology alliances is stronger for firms in high, rather than low, uncertainty avoidance cultures and for firms in less, rather than more, masculine countries; perceived technological uncertainty is related to the pursuit of equity ties only for firms in individualistic (not collectivistic) countries.

Table 4

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Moderating Effect

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Country	Diener & Diener (1995)	Undergraduates in 31 countries	Survey and archival	Individualism-Collectivism; friendship satisfaction; life satisfaction with self; job satisfaction	The relationship between both friendship satisfaction and satisfaction with self and life satisfaction was stronger in individualistic, rather than collectivistic, nations.
Country	Robie et al. (1998)	35 empirical studies	Meta-analysis	Power Distance; job level; job satisfaction	The relationship between job level and job satisfaction is weaker in low, rather than high, power distance countries.

Table 5

Summaries of Articles Reviewed – Culture as a Criterion Variable

<b>Level of Analysis</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Countries/ Sample</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Key Findings</b>
Individual	Gaines et al. (1997)	102 employees, 177 graduate students, 48 high school students, 53 undergraduates	Survey	Individualism-Collectivism; demography	Anglos scored lower on collectivism than people of color; people of color scored higher on race/ethnicity which, in turn, was positively related to collectivism.
Individual	Freeman (1997)	438 parents of primary school children in Sri Lanka	Survey	Individualism; Collectivism; socio-economic status; English fluency; occupational status; age	Collectivism was negatively related to socio-economic status, fluency in English, occupational status, and age; individualism was positively related to urban residence and negatively related to educational status and occupational status.
Individual	Marshall (1997)	150 employees of various classes from Indonesia and New Zealand	Survey	Individualism; social class; nationality	Social class was a stronger predictor of individualism than was nationality.
Country	Vandello & Cohen (1999)	U.S.	Archival	Individualism-Collectivism; poverty levels; population density; history of plantation-style farming; percentage of minorities; historical percentages of slaves	Hawaii and the Deep South states (e.g., South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas, Virginia, and North Carolina) were the most collectivistic while states in the Mountain West and Great Plains (e.g., Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Alaska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas) were the least collectivistic; collectivism was positively correlated with poverty levels, population density, historically labor intensive plantation-style farming, percentage of minorities in the state, and historical percentage of slaves per state.