

# CROSS-CULTURAL SOCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

*Michael Harris Bond*

Department of Psychology, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin NT, Hong Kong

*Peter B. Smith*

School of Social Sciences, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QN, England

KEY WORDS: individualism-collectivism, independence-interdependence, self-concept, social influence, work behavior

---

## ABSTRACT

This review considers recent theoretical and empirical developments in cross-cultural studies within social and organizational psychology. It begins with a description of the importance and the difficulties of universalizing psychological science. It then continues with an examination of theoretical work on both the internal-proximal and the external-distal constraints that mediate culture's influence on behavior. Influences on social cognition are documented by describing research on self-concept, self-esteem, emotions, attribution processes, person perception, interpersonal attraction, and justice. Group processes are addressed in the areas of leadership, decision-making, and negotiation, and research in organizational psychology is examined with respect to work motivation and work behavior. The review concludes that considerable improvement is evident in recent cross-cultural research. However, future research must include a broader range of cultures and attend more closely to the levels at which cultural effects should be analyzed, and cultural samples must be unpackaged in more psychologically useful ways.

---

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	206
<i>The Promise of the Cross-Cultural Approach.....</i>	207
<i>The Current Scene .....</i>	207

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENTS .....	209
<i>Theories of Internal-Proximal Constraints</i> .....	210
<i>Theories of External-Distal Constraints</i> ..	211
SOCIAL COGNITION .....	212
<i>The Self-Concept</i> .....	212
<i>Self-Esteem</i> .....	214
<i>Emotion</i> .....	214
<i>Attribution Processes</i> .....	215
INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR.....	216
<i>Person Perception</i> .....	216
<i>Interpersonal Attraction</i> .....	217
<i>Justice</i> .....	218
GROUP PROCESSES .....	219
<i>Leadership</i> .....	220
<i>Decision-Making</i> .....	221
<i>Negotiation</i> .....	222
ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR .....	223
<i>Work Motivation</i> .....	223
<i>Work Behavior</i> .....	224
CONCLUSIONS .....	226

[A] human race speaking many tongues, regarding many values, and holding different convictions about the meaning of life sooner or later will have to consult all that is human.

G Murphy (1969, p. 528)

## INTRODUCTION

An American social psychologist, new to the cross-cultural area, attended the 1994 Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology. He later wrote:

I have a sense that the field is suffering not just from an identity crisis, but from the overwhelming magnitude of that task we are undertaking and the enormous difficulty of doing valuable research in this area. I heard some fine talks, but it is clear that the field is really in its infancy, and to my way of thinking, it confronts the most difficult domain of knowledge in the social sciences. I found it stimulating and exciting, but also a bit daunting. I think we just have to plunge ahead and make the mistakes that will ultimately lead to progress (W Stephan, personal communication).

These astute observations capture the essence of our current challenge in cross-cultural psychology. Where have we cross-cultural psychologists come from? What have we found? Whither are we going? These are the issues we shall address in deciding if cross-cultural social and organizational psychology has indeed come of age.

### *The Promise of the Cross-Cultural Approach*

Psychology is the scientific study of human behavior. Its presumptive goal is to achieve universal status by generalizing results found in particular ecological, social, legal, institutional, and political settings. Such generalization requires testing in maximally different cultures. "In no other way can we be certain that what we believe to be...regularities are not merely peculiarities, the product of some limited set of historical or cultural or political circumstances" (Kohn 1987, p. 713).

Tests for generalizability often produce extensive discrepancies (Amir & Sharon 1987). Of course, these discrepancies can arise because of differences in testing methods. "To obviate the possibility that differences in findings are merely artifacts of differences in method, one tries to design studies to be comparable with one another in their methods, to establish both linguistic and conceptual equivalence in the wording of questions and in the coding of answers, and to establish truly equivalent indices of the underlying concepts" (Kohn 1987, p. 720).

This requirement is no mean challenge, and early, obvious failures have left cross-cultural psychology with a dubious legacy. Today, however, psychologists show greater vigilance and sophistication about the equivalence issue (van de Vijver & Leung 1996). Consequently, we may feel more confident about the validity of differences found across cultural settings.

With methodological concerns minimized, one can use discrepancies to comprehend the anomalous. As Kohn (1987) has noted, "what appear to be cross-national differences may really be instances of lawful regularities, if thought of in terms of some larger, more encompassing interpretation" (p. 716). This is mind-stretching work, but it is, however, essential if psychology is to claim universality. Carefully wrought cross-cultural psychology can serve as a midwife to this heady enterprise.

### *The Current Scene*

The growth is illustrated by the recent appearance of textbooks in cross-cultural psychology as a whole (Berry et al 1992, Brislin 1993, Lonner & Malpass 1994, Segall et al 1990), cross-cultural social psychology (Matsumoto 1994, Moghaddam et al 1993, Smith & Bond 1994, Triandis 1994), and cross-cultural organizational psychology (Adler 1991, Erez & Earley 1993, Triandis et al 1993a), as well as by the appearance of volumes arising from the congresses of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (Bouvy et al 1994, Keats et al 1989, Iwawaki et al 1992, Pandey et al 1995) and of a completely new edition of the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Berry et al 1996). The growth of cross-cultural research and the attention given to this area of study is encouraging. But how well positioned are we? How much

progress are we able to report since the publication, in this series, of reviews of cross-cultural psychology by Kagitcibasi & Berry (1989) and Shweder & Sullivan (1993)?

Research in psychology is dominated by Americans. Prestigious psychology journals are largely monopolized by North Americans, who rarely cite the work of outsiders and who work on questions that are often themselves culturally distinctive (Hogan & Emler 1978). The state of affairs extends to cross-cultural psychology itself. Content analysis of the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* since its inception in 1970 reveals that, even there, North American theories and authors predominate (Ongel & Smith 1994). This ethnocentrism, as noted by Moghaddam et al (1993), is fueled by the general use of the English language in journals and at international conferences.

One small inroad into this North American domination of the field is the emergence of psychology both from and about Asian cultures (Bond 1986, 1995; Gudykunst 1993; Komin 1990; Misumi 1985). Sustained by the economic development of the Five Dragons, this work has stimulated and been responsive to the construct of cultural collectivism. Given researchers' predilection for two-culture comparisons, however, an East Asian variant of collectivism may be gaining a disproportionate scientific ascendancy (Singelis 1994). We need to decenter collectivism by undertaking studies in South America, Africa, and the former Communist Bloc (A Realo et al, submitted).

We note in fairness that many North American psychologists and journal editors are promoting the visibility of psychologists and psychology within other cultural groups (Rosenzweig 1992). There is some indication of growing reliance upon theories held by scholars indigenous to India (Adair et al 1993) and other countries (Kim & Berry 1993). Some textbooks are introducing more cross-cultural material, and the journal *Psychology and Developing Societies* has been established.

Greater attention is also being given to the development of procedures for ensuring the equivalence of measurements made at different locations. For instance, item response theory can be used to assess the equivalence of questionnaire responses (Bontempo 1993, Ellis et al 1993); careful thought can be given to item appropriateness (Lonner 1980); and cultural differences in response bias can be mapped (Hui & Triandis 1989, Marin & Marin 1991, Marin et al 1993) and controlled for by within-subject standardization of responses (Leung & Bond 1989). Methodological prerequisites are enumerated for valid cross-cultural experiments (Earley & Mosakowski 1995) and for studies of organizations (Lytle et al 1995, Shenkar & von Glinow 1994). All these developments contribute to a gradual cultural decentering of psychology, but the remaining obstacles are real and considerable (Ongel & Smith 1994, p. 50):

High on the list of further impediments...must lie the difficulty of assembling diverse and truly collaborative research teams where members contribute equally toward research designs that will have validity in a number of different cultural settings. The development of such teams takes time, tact, and resources, and publication pressures militate against setting them up. Where some of the collaborating researchers are from high power distance cultures, [and hence are more likely to defer to project leaders from cultures low in power distance,] or are former graduate students of their present research partners, the encouragement to rely on established Western measures and theories is further intensified.

We hope this review will empower voices of science from other cultures to contribute to the universalizing of psychology.

## THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Definitions of culture abound, and the sheer number displays the complexity of their referent (Krewer & Jahoda 1993, Misra & Gergen 1993, Soudjin et al 1990). We adopt Poortinga's (1992) broad position on culture as a set of "shared constraints that limit the behavior repertoire available to members of a certain...group" (p. 10). These "boundary conditions for behavior" (p. 12) include the internal constraints of genetic and cultural transmission and the external constraints of ecological, socioeconomical, historical, and situational contexts, with a range of distal to proximal effects within each type of constraint.

This definition of culture may be married to a position of universalism, in which "it is assumed that the same psychological processes are operating in all humans independent of culture" (Poortinga 1992, p. 13). Cultural constraints then limit and shape the behavioral expression of the universal process. Universals, as these psychological processes are called, are grist for the cross-cultural psychology mill. They may be identified conceptually by careful attention to the anthropological literature (Lonner 1980), by historical exegesis (Adamopoulos 1988), or through evolutionary analyses (Chasiotis & Keller 1994). Alternatively, they may also be identified empirically through careful cross-cultural replications, as seen in Kohn et al's (1990) work on class structure, job specialization, and the transmission of values in three cultures, or in Costa & McCrae's (1992) work on the Big Five factors of personality.

What typology of cultures and their behavioral constraints shall be used in the search for universals? We address this question on the basis of Poortinga's differentiation between internal and external constraints, each of which involves culturally transmitted values and beliefs in eco-socio-historical contexts.

*Theories of Internal-Proximal Constraints*

**VALUES** The dominant development of the past decade in theories of internal-proximal constraints has been Schwartz's (1992, 1994) work on values. A wide reading by Schwartz of previous theory, methodology, and cultural anthropology preceded the creation of a comprehensive values instrument that has been carefully administered to equivalent samples of teachers and students in almost 50 countries. The results of this work form the basis of a circumplex model of 10 universal value domains at the individual level (1992) and 7 at the cultural level with scores for 38 culture regions (1994). These culture-level scores have been related to Hofstede's (1980) four dimensions of cultural variation and to both Hofstede's and the Chinese Culture Connection's (1987) nation scores (Bond 1995). Schwartz's country-level scores have also been related to country-level indices of physical, economic, and social health (Chan & Bond 1995). In terms of both convergent and external validity, the Schwartz domains appear most promising.

Schwartz's initial work, however, was at the individual level, and his culture-level work was predicated on this foundation. Future cross-cultural work can proceed at the individual level through use of the Schwartz Value Survey (Feather 1994, Leung et al 1994). Such a "translation" of the Survey to the individual was not possible with Hofstede's (1980) classic results, eager as many psychologists were to leap from the study of culture to the study of the individual. We hope that Schwartz will soon publish the average scores of people from his culture samples on the 10 individual-level domains [as Bond (1988) did for the Chinese Culture Connection's nation scores (1987)], so researchers can work at their preferred level of study.

An additional development is Smith et al's (1995a) analysis of the Trompenaars (1993) data base. Data from 43 countries were derived from a questionnaire designed to show seven patterns of cultural variation. Smith et al identified two separate dimensions, i.e. conservatism–egalitarian commitment and loyal involvement–utilitarian involvement, which had been conflated in Hofstede's (1980) discussion of collectivism. This empirical refinement of the collectivism construct is important, given its current ascendancy in cross-cultural studies (Kim et al 1994, Triandis 1995) and its further refinement at the individual level into horizontal as well as vertical components (Singelis et al 1995).

**BELIEFS** Values tap what is important, beliefs what is true. Scales measuring cultural constructs sometimes mix values and beliefs together. It is important, however, for theoretical (Feather 1988) and empirical (Leung et al 1994) reasons to keep these constructs separate. For example, Smith et al (1995b) have analyzed responses from 43 countries to Rotter's (1966) locus of control scale.

This scale is used to tap beliefs, not values, about internal vs external control of reinforcement. Smith et al found three dimensions of belief about causality, only one of which paralleled Rotter's original formulation. These dimensions of beliefs along which countries may be arrayed overlap only moderately with country measures of value.

Locus-of-control beliefs are important in predicting individual behavior and are closely related to discussions of key cultural differences in individuals' experiences of control, harmony, and submission with respect to the environment. The experience of personal agency and people's needs to believe in their personal agency are probably universal; therefore, we would hope that locally valid measures of this belief will be developed and its role in explaining cross-cultural differences examined.

Other beliefs that vary cross-culturally, e.g. beliefs about a just world (Furnham 1993), global interdependencies (Der-Kerabetian 1992), and work behaviors (Furnham et al 1993), are promising areas for explaining cultural differences in behavior. A taxonomy of such beliefs would help to move the field beyond its excessive reliance on values (K Leung & MH Bond, unpublished observations).

### *Theories of External-Distal Constraints*

Factor-analytic studies of ecological, social, economic, and political indicators may be exploited to provide a taxonomy of external-distal constraints on individual behavior. Studies in the 1970s yielded many factors, but economic development or so-called modernization was invariably the first obtained. The fact that this dimension is only one among many has been used to dismiss simplistic assertions about convergence (Smith & Bond 1994). We expect that variations along the remaining dimensions give considerable scope for nations and their constituent cultures to exert varying influences, once economic development has been partialled out (Bond 1991).

With the notable exceptions of Berry (1979) and Triandis (1984), recent researchers have been loath to grasp the nettle of external-distal constraints. The variables involved are perceived by many to lie outside the discipline. Their translation into the psychological realm is considered tenuous and uncharted or else probably isomorphic with cultural value dimensions. Although understandable, such avoidance is lamentable, especially in light of ubiquitous calls for cross-disciplinary integration (Easton & Shelling 1991, Gabrenya 1988). Much may be achieved in this area, however, as a recent study by Linssen & Hagendoorn (1994) on European nationality stereotypes can attest.

Almost all current models of cultural difference are thus proximal rather than distal. Fiske (1992), however, proposes a model of four domains of social relationship present in all cultures: communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing. According to Fiske, cultural difference

is defined in terms of the relative reliance on these four bases of relationship. Fiske (1993) replicated results of an earlier US study showing that when Koreans, Chinese, Bengalis, and Liberians made errors in naming a person, their errors referred to others within the same relationship type.

## SOCIAL COGNITION

### *The Self-Concept*

Triandis (1990), who has focused on the close relation of the self to the in-group and on the greater distance of the self from the out-group, hypothesizes that cultural collectivism leads its members to make more social responses on the “Who Are You?” test (Bochner 1994). Triandis (1993) defines culture-level collectivism as a cultural syndrome encompassing a broad range of behaviors. Triandis has also developed measures of the corresponding individual-level construct, allocentrism-idiocentrism, both within and across cultures (Triandis et al 1993b).

Markus & Kitayama (1991) have focused instead on the sense of interdependence that characterizes the experience of self in collective cultural systems. Such a socially shared, normative construction of the self has challenging implications for developmental (Kagitcibasi 1995), personality (Miller 1994), and social (Singelis et al 1995) areas of psychology. Surprisingly, attempts to measure the interdependent and independent components of the self-concept have shown them to be orthogonal, not bipolar constructs (Gudykunst et al 1994, Singelis 1994). Persons from collectivist cultures feel more interdependence, and interdependent peoples in all cultures endorse values such as restrictive conformity, prosociality, and security. Individuals from individualistic cultures feel more independence, and independent people in all cultures endorse self-direction (Gudykunst et al 1994). Scores on interdependence are positively related to emotional contagion (TM Singelis 1994, unpublished data) and embarrassability (Singelis & Sharkey 1995), both within and across cultures.

Self-concept clarity (SCC) is “the extent to which an individual’s specific self-beliefs are clearly and confidently defined, internally consistent, and temporarily stable” (JD Campbell, PD Trapnell, SJ Heine, IM Katz, L Lavallee, DR Lehman, submitted). These authors argue that people with an interdependent self-concept should have less clarity. As a test of this prediction, they compared samples of Japanese and Canadians, who represent persons from a collectivist and individualist culture, respectively, and showed that Japanese are indeed lower on SCC than Canadians.

**GENDER SELF-CONCEPT** Williams & Best (1990) examined sex stereotypes in 30 countries and concluded that there is substantial agreement among cultures concerning the psychological characteristics differentially associated with men and women. The ratings were scored for activity, strength of affective meaning, and favorability. The content of the male stereotype turned out to be more active and stronger in affective meaning, but not any more favorable. Across cultures, stronger male stereotypes, i.e. greater attribution of affectively active, strong characteristics to males than to females, are associated with lower levels of literacy and socioeconomic development and with a lower proportion of women enrolled in college.

Best & Williams (1994) also showed that in all cultures, men and women differ in their self-reports of masculine and feminine characteristics, although the gender difference is typically less than that reflected in gender stereotypes. Best & Williams also reported that the gender difference in total affective meaning of self-reports was greater in countries in which power distance was high (i.e. more authoritarian social structure) and social-economic level, percentage of Christians, and proportion of female college graduates were low.

**ETHNIC IDENTITY** Weinreich (1986) defines ethnic identity as “that part of the totality of one’s self-construal made up of those dimensions that express the continuity between one’s construal of past ancestry and future aspirations in relation to ethnicity” (p. 308). This is a complex construct, and measures of one’s ethnic identification can include assessments of one’s ethnicity-related practices, the importance one attaches to those practices, one’s subjective self-labeling, and the evaluation given to this self-labeling and to one’s ascribed ethnicity (Rosenthal & Feldman 1992). Weinreich has developed an idiographic technique called Identity Structure Analysis (ISA) that has been applied to cases of ethnic identification and conflicts arising from bicultural parenting, intergroup conflict, and superordinate group demands (Weinreich 1995).

Weinreich’s thinking concerns how the individual negotiates the often treacherous cross-currents of ethnic identities ascribed to that individual by others. University students in Hong Kong, for example, perceive themselves as similar to but distinct from typical Hong Kong Chinese. They ascribe to themselves elements of a valued Western identity in equal measure to their Hong Kong identity (Weinreich et al 1994). This creative synthesizing of local identities provides an escape from the intergroup conflict that must arise when there is no alternative to ascribed ethnic identity. The identifications achieved by individuals rather than ascribed to them by others then become the basis for various forms of intergroup behavior, such as linguistic differentiation (Giles & Viladot 1994) and styles of conflict management (Ting-Toomey et al 1994).

### *Self-Esteem*

Because self-esteem is central to Western theories of psychopathology and social functioning (Taylor & Brown 1988), self-esteem measures have been much used in non-Western research (Leung & Leung 1992) and in cross-cultural comparisons (Bond & Cheung 1983).

Are self-esteem measures derived from cross-culturally equivalent ways of construing self-concept, from which self-esteem derives? The work of Watkins & Dong (1994) with Chinese, Nepalese, Nigerian, Filipino, and Australian children, using the Shavelson model (Shavelson & Bolus 1982) of the self-concept, confirms construct validity across cultures. Such models of the self-concept are, however, individualistic in conceptualization. When collective or group-based elements of the self-concept are included, construct similarity may break down.

Measures of self-esteem used in cross-cultural comparisons are often based on evaluations of one's individual attributes rather than on one's group attributes (Feather & McKee 1993). Cross-cultural comparisons may therefore miss differences in self-evaluation derived from one's collective identity (Luhtanen & Crocker 1992). Reported cultural differences in self-esteem may be misleading if the construct has not been fully assessed. Debates about whether people from certain cultural groups are more socially modest or internally depressed (DeGooyer & Williams 1992) may thus be premature.

The assessment question may also affect construct validity. Individually based levels of self-esteem seem to be derived from similar components of personality across cultural groups (Ho 1994) and to be meaningfully related to social responses in different cultures (Feather & McKee 1993). Collectively derived measures of self-esteem, however, predict important outcomes like psychological well-being for some ethnic groups but not for others (Crocker et al 1994). How one measures self-esteem across cultures will obviously affect what one discovers about the concept.

### *Emotion*

The cross-cultural study of emotion (Mesquita & Frijda 1992) has been stimulated by Markus & Kitayama's (1991) seminal paper and a subsequent conference (Kitayama & Markus 1994). However, as Frijda & Mesquita (1994) have observed, cross-cultural researchers on emotion have been preoccupied with labels. Given the interpersonal focus of this chapter, we endorse Frijda & Mesquita's definition of emotions as "first and foremost, modes of relating to the environment: states of readiness for engaging, or not engaging, in interaction with that environment" (p. 51). Aspects of that engagement include "modifying inter-individual interactions...at the moment;...regulating the bal-

ance of power;...determining general patterns of social interaction;...and...motivating social cohesion” (pp. 82–83).

This centrality of emotion in social life underscores its importance for understanding cross-cultural differences in behavior. Recent work has been concentrated on appraisal of the events that generate emotions (Ellsworth 1994). The dimensions of appraisal appear to be universal (Mauro et al 1992), as are appraisal patterns activated by many emotionally relevant situations (Mesquita 1993). The weight accorded to certain of these dimensions (e.g. controllability, causal agency) varies across cultures, as does the importance of certain emotions. These differences are explained by variations in cultural independence-interdependence, a construct that accounts for differences in the social embeddedness of the emotions (Frijda & Mesquita 1994).

In recent years fewer cross-cultural studies have examined how emotions are communicated to others (Russell 1994) and how emotional displays affect the responses of others to the actor, to the ongoing interaction, and to their social group (Frijda & Mesquita 1994). Such additional work would be most welcome to the field.

### *Attribution Processes*

Although a great deal of research on diverse aspects of attribution theory has been carried out, it has been criticized for committing the “fundamental attribution researcher’s error” (Russell 1982), the assumption on the part of researchers that their conceptualization of what is under investigation corresponds to their subjects’ ideas. The criticism particularly has force in cross-cultural research. Because researchers’ conceptualizations and measures are almost always Western-based and subjects’ attributional models are not, the dangers of “imposed-etic” research (Berry 1989) are present.

Watkins & Cheng (1995), for instance, showed that the perceived dimensions underlying the Revised Causal Dimension Scale, which was developed using American subjects, do not reflect the dimensions of causality used by Hong Kong students. The investigators argue that this difference arises because of the relative Chinese emphasis on the role of effort as an explanation for achievement (Leung 1995a). This difference in factor structure renders suspect cross-cultural comparisons on relative frequency of causal attribution categories. Part of a cross-culturalist’s answer to this inconsistency is to work with more open-ended causal accounts (Kashima & Triandis 1986), which permit indigenous constructs such as the Chinese *yuan* (fatedness) (Yang & Ho 1988) to be included. Local instruments can then be developed that assess the dimensionality of causal categories in various cultures (Luk & Bond 1992). Equivalent categories may then be compared across cultures on issues such as salience, self-esteem maintenance, interpersonal modesty, and responsibility

attribution. Crittenden (1995) explores these concerns within Chinese attribution research.

Nevertheless, a promising research theme has emerged in the study of attribution processes. Shweder & Bourne (1982) argued that many non-Western cultures inculcate a "holistic world view" that promotes "context-dependent, occasion-bound thinking." Accordingly, attributions made by members of non-Western cultures are more external/situational (Morris & Peng 1994). In research consistent with this assessment of non-Western attribution processes, Newman (1993) found US allocentrics less willing to make trait attributions, while Kashima et al (1992) found non-Westerners less likely to believe that others' behaviors are consistent with internal loci such as attitudes. This less-personal attributional logic can also aid our understanding of cultural variations in social processes such as morality judgments (Miller & Bersoff 1992).

## INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR

### *Person Perception*

Dixon (1977) asserts that trait terms are used in every known language to distinguish persons. Studies of implicit personality theory in any language studied to date indicate that a five-factor model can describe the organization of perceived personality (Bond 1994; see Butcher & Rouse, this volume). The apparent universality of the broad categories of extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience may arise from their importance in directing universal types of social behaviors such as association, subordination, and formality (Bond & Forgas 1984).

Within the general framework of this model, culture exercises its influence by accentuating certain of the Big Five dimensions over others. In free-response trait descriptions of themselves (Ip & Bond 1995) or of others (Chang et al 1994), Chinese, for example, use the category of conscientiousness more often and use the category of agreeableness less often than do Americans. Moreover, the rated importance of each of the five categories varies among cultural groups (Williams et al 1995), and these categories are differentially weighted in guiding social behavior (Bond & Forgas 1984).

Such differences may be explained by an ecological model emphasizing the adaptive significance of certain types of responding in different cultural environments (Zebrowitz-McArthur 1988). The universally adaptive significance of caring for immature members of the species is obvious. As a result, physical cues of immaturity, such as babyfacedness (McArthur & Berry 1987) and vocal softness (Peng et al 1993), have been related pan-culturally to personality perceptions of dependence and weakness. Similarly, mating with youthful members of the species is biologically adaptive, so people with youthful gaits

are regarded as sexier across cultures (Montepare & Zebrowitz 1993). Likewise, the cues for physical attractiveness enjoy considerable universality (Perrett et al 1994) and connote reproductive fitness (Cunningham 1986). It may be for this latter, biological reason that the personalities of attractive persons are judged as more sociable across cultures (L Albright, Q Dong, TE Malloy, DA Kenney, D Yu, submitted). Through these examples, we can see how our common biological agenda accounts for universals of personality perceptions. The variable cultural impact of cues such as vocal speed (Peng et al 1993) or smiling (Matsumoto & Kudoh 1993) is harder to explain persuasively, because the linkage of these cues to dimensions of culture is less apparent.

### *Interpersonal Attraction*

People in individualistic cultures believe that internal dispositions drive behavior (Kashima et al 1992); therefore topics like interpersonal attraction and love engage Western psychologists almost exclusively (Hogan & Emler 1978). However, owing to modernization and the attendant increase in personal choice it offers people, scientific interest in interpersonal attraction is growing outside the West (Hatfield & Rapson 1993). This is a welcome development because only scattered evidence about the processes of interpersonal attraction exists from other cultures (Cheng et al 1995, Rai & Rathore 1988, Rodrigue & Iwawaki 1986). This evidence generally confirms Western models of similarity or balance.

Future work in other cultures must focus on the nature of attraction itself. For example, Shaver et al (1991) found that the mainland Chinese conceptualization of passionate love is dramatically different from Italian and American conceptualizations. Similarly, Ellis et al (1995) found that Mexicans assign a different subjective meaning to love than do Americans or Spaniards. Clearly, conceptual equivalence of key terms is an issue that must be carefully assessed in this area.

Cross-cultural work on behavioral benchmarks such as mate preferences (Liston & Salts 1988), friendship selection (Goodwin & Tang 1991), sexual activity (Hatfield & Rapson 1993), or attachment style (Wu & Shaver 1992) sidesteps this equivalence problem. The marriage relationship, for example, entails similar social requirements in all cultures, so it is perhaps not surprising that a high degree of cross-cultural agreement was found in Buss et al's (1990) multicultural study of desired spousal attributes. One complex of qualities, including chastity in women, domestic skills, and interest in home and children did, however, vary negatively as a function of cultural modernity. This latter variable and its associate, individualism, have been related to the importance of love itself in establishing and maintaining the marriage bond (KK Dion & KL Dion 1991, 1993; Levine et al 1995) and to the style of loving likely to be found in heterosexual relationships (KL Dion & KK Dion 1993).

Research into how individualism and other cultural dimensions affect interpersonal attraction is still needed as modernization proceeds.

### *Justice*

The topic of justice was first explored cross-culturally in the context of resource allocation. Bond et al (1982) argued and found that the concern of people in collectivist cultures for maintaining harmony should result in egalitarian resource divisions, and that the concern of people in individualistic cultures for performance should result in equitable resource divisions. Need-based allocations are also more likely in collectivist cultures because of concerns for group solidarity (Berman et al 1985).

Subsequent studies have revealed inconsistencies in research results based on the above reasoning (e.g. Chen 1995). Leung (1995b) has advanced a contextual model to integrate conflicting results. He argues that the nature of the social relationship between the allocator of the reward and the recipient (in-group or out-group member) and of the role relationship (supervisor allocating rewards to other performers, or coworkers allocating them to self and coworker) mediates the impact of culture on reward allocation. According to Leung, collectivists should only show an egalitarian division when allocating to an in-group member who is also a coworker. Otherwise, equity is observed. Leung (1995b) encourages cross-cultural researchers to test his model explicitly. He also challenges them to measure directly putative mediating variables such as performance enhancement that underlie reward distribution (Bond et al 1992). Only then can we build persuasive, pan-cultural theories of social behavior (Messick 1988).

Justice researchers have also focused on resource allocation procedures. Procedural concerns involve both the formal steps and the interpersonal style followed by allocators to reach their decisions (Tyler & Bies 1990). Judgments based on procedural justice are typically more convincing in cultures where authority and the decisions of people in power are widely accepted than are judgments based on outcome fairness. Tyler et al (submitted) extended this research across cultures. They argued that the preference for low power distance, which is evident in the United States, is associated with a relative emphasis on procedural rather than instrumental judgments in evaluating authorities. This conclusion was supported by Tyler et al both cross-culturally using Japanese respondents and within culture using an individual measure of preferred power distance.

Psychologists have recently examined human rights observance (Clemence et al 1995, Doise et al 1991, Humana 1992). Doise et al (1994) have linked individuals' positions on human rights to value structures. Future research might additionally consider the distinction between procedural and instrumental concerns.

## GROUP PROCESSES

Many social scientists interested in group behavior assume that the phenomena identified in North America are universals. Whether these phenomena vary in strength by culture and whether indigenous approaches may identify wholly different additional phenomena is unclear. Studies of several known behavioral phenomena have found substantially different effects. Social loafing (Latané et al 1979) is not only absent but is significantly reversed in China (Earley 1989), Israel (Earley 1993), and Japan (Matsui et al 1987). In the China and Israel studies, subjects' endorsement of collectivist values predicted enhancement rather than curtailment of performance in group settings. Earley (1994) compared business employees in China and the United States and found Chinese performance was enhanced by a collectively focused training input, whereas US employees responded better to an individually focused input. Employees' collectivism scores predicted both culture-level and individual-level effects.

Bond & Smith (1995) report a meta-analysis of 133 replications of the Asch conformity study. After design variations are accounted for, Hofstede's collectivism scores predict higher levels of conformity. Replications of this type, however, can only detect the type of social influence processes captured by the Asch paradigm. Fernandez Dols (1992) proposes that in some cultures conformity processes may operate in a rather different manner. He finds a higher incidence of "perverse" norms in Spain than in Anglo countries. These are norms that are agreed to exist but that are only rarely enforced. Triandis (1995) identified cultures in which this type of norm is widespread as "loose" rather than "tight." Whereas the Asch paradigm shows conformity to depend upon majority size, Fernandez Dols argued that within a system of perverse norms, authority figures can maintain control by determining when norms will be enforced and when they will not.

Basic aspects of group performance, such as productivity and conformity, thus differ substantially by culture. These differences may well prove problematic in multicultural teams. Merritt & Helmreich (1995) found that US airline pilots and flight attendants endorsed lower power distance and collectivism than did pilots and attendants within the same airlines from seven East Asian countries. Anglo student groups were found to be less cooperative toward others than were non-Anglo groups (Cox et al 1991) and more in favor of risk-taking (Watson & Kumar 1992). However, although culturally diverse student teams experienced more difficulties in working together initially, Watson et al (1993) found their related performance three months later superior to that of culturally homogeneous teams.

## *Leadership*

In his summary of an extensive program of leadership research in Japan, Misumi (1985) proposed that researchers distinguish between *general* or universal functions that effective leaders must carry out and the *specific* ways in which these functions are expressed. The P (Task Performance) and M (Group Maintenance) general leadership functions that, according to Misumi, predict leadership effectiveness resemble dimensions postulated by North American researchers. The more significant aspect of Misumi's Japanese results is that they consistently indicate that different *specific* behaviors contribute to each function in differing situations. Smith et al (1989) obtained similar results in their comparison of assembly-line workers' perceptions of supervisors in Japan, Hong Kong, the United States, and Great Britain. For instance, a *specific* behavior such as eating lunch with one's work team was associated with a high M score in some locations but not in others.

Misumi's work suggests a way in which one can better understand apparent contradictions between the results of different leadership studies. We may expect that studies that used relatively *general* characterizations of leader style will yield evidence of cross-cultural consistency in effectiveness, whereas studies of more *specific* leader attributes will detect cultural or organizational contingencies. In the remainder of this paragraph we consider studies that have used *general* style measures. Smith et al (1992) found that work teams within Japan, Hong Kong, the United States, and Great Britain led by leaders rated high for P and M all achieved higher work quality. Bass & Avolio's (1993) review of cross-cultural tests of their theory of transformational leadership indicates greater efficacy of the transformational style from 14 countries. Furthermore, Campbell et al (1993) found no difference in preference for participation in decision-making between US and Singaporean business students. Finally, Furnham & Stringfield (1994) found no difference in ratings on attributes such as innovation and commitment among Chinese and non-Chinese managers working for a Hong Kong airline. The results of these studies are as one may expect for studies using generalized measures of leader style.

Other cross-cultural studies of leadership (reviewed by Dorfman 1995) have been influenced by Western contingency theories and have consequently focused more upon *specific* attributes of effective leadership than the *general* functions that may underlie variations in leadership style. Okechuku (1994) found differences in the perceived traits associated with managers' ratings of effective subordinates in Canada, Hong Kong, and China, as did Black & Porter (1991), who compared managers' ratings in the United States and Hong Kong. Gerstner & Day (1994) asked students originally from eight different nations residing in the United States to rate how well 59 traits typified a business leader. The three country-level dimensions that were identified corre-

lated highly with Hofstede dimensions of individualism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance. Ayman & Chemers (1991) found some support for Fiedler & Chemers' (1984) contingency-based leader match theory among Mexican workers. Schmidt & Yeh (1992) compared leader influence in Japan, Taiwan, Australia, and Great Britain. Although a broadly similar range of influence strategies was found, they factored together distinctively within each national sample. Howell et al (1995), who contrasted business-leader effectiveness in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and the United States, found general effects for leader supportiveness and contingent reward, but cultural specificity for participation in decision-making and contingent punishment. Jago et al (1993) compared preferences to participate of managers in the United States and six European countries and found differences were correlated positively with power-distance scores for the seven countries. The Industrial Democracy in Europe International Research Group (IDE) (1993) carried out a longitudinal replication study of participation in 10 European countries and found differences reported in an earlier study were still apparent, though somewhat attenuated. These studies confirm that when more specific measures of leader style are employed, cultural differences are more apparent.

### *Decision-Making*

If the generality of some measures of leader style leaves unclear the relation of leader behavior to cultural constraints, then studies on the making of specific managerial decisions may provide greater clarity. Smith & Peterson (1988) proposed an analysis of leadership based around the concept of "event management," i.e. the exercise of choice in how events are managed. They suggest that managers handle events on the basis of their own experience, consultation with others, reliance upon rules, and so forth. Smith et al (1994a) surveyed managers in 16 countries and found that in individualist, low power distance nations, managers rely more heavily on their own experience and training than do those from collectivist, high power distance countries. Hofstede's country-level value measures thus predict reported managerial behaviors, despite a 25-year gap in data collection. Further studies of event management show differences in how Japanese, British, and American electronic assembly work teams handle events (Peterson et al 1990). Work teams judged most effective by their supervisors show, in Japan, more reliance on peers; in the United States, more reference to superiors; and, in Great Britain, greater self-reliance (Smith et al 1994b). Tse et al (1988) found Chinese managers more inclined than Hong Kong Chinese or Canadians to refer to their superiors. Wang & Heller (1993) compared decision-making of British and Chinese managers and found both nation and type of decision affected the degree of subordinate participation and supervisor consultation.

Yates & Lee (1995) found Chinese and several other East Asian groups (but not Japanese) more confident than Americans that their decisions were correct. They attribute this to a greater propensity to select the first adequate problem solution that is identified rather than to survey a range of alternatives before deciding. Radford et al (1991, 1993) found differences in decision-making style between Australian and Japanese students. Consistent with US counterparts from earlier research, Australians favored the "choice" style, which emphasizes careful individual thought. The Japanese, however, reported greater use of three other styles, which all involved greater reference to others. As Yates & Lee also found, the Japanese were less confident of their decisions. These differences may be explicable in terms of variations in individualism-collectivism among East Asian countries, Australia, and the United States.

### *Negotiation*

Group processes within cross-cultural negotiation should provide particularly clear illustrations of the effects of divergence in values across cultures. Studies of intracultural simulated buyer-seller negotiations indicate that while cooperative problem-solving strategies are most effective in the United States, competitive behavior works better in Russia (Graham et al 1992), Taiwan (Graham et al 1988), Germany, Great Britain (Campbell et al 1988), Mexico, and Francophone Canada (Adler et al 1987). Similarly, Gabrenya (1990) found that US students cooperated on a task better with strangers than did Taiwanese students. These results support the view that members of collectivist cultures are more competitive with out-groups than are members of individualist cultures. This proposition is tested more directly by DKS Chan, HC Triandis, PJ Carnevale, A Tam, MH Bond (submitted), who compared intracultural negotiation behavior of Hong Kong Chinese and US students and obtained measures of their individualist or collectivist values. Hong Kong students responded more to cooperation and yielded to an in-group negotiator more than to an out-group negotiator. Similar differences were obtained by Trubisky et al (1991), who compared intracultural conflict resolution preferences of US and Taiwanese students. The authors of both studies attributed their results to differences in individualism-collectivism. In a more detailed review of culture and negotiation, Leung (1995b) concludes that behavior is influenced both by variations in individualism-collectivism and by specific situational demands.

How closely the processes of intracultural and intercultural negotiation parallel one another remains unclear. Tse et al (1994) compared intracultural and intercultural negotiating behaviors of Chinese and Canadian executives. Neither party modified its approach when negotiating cross-culturally. Chinese negotiators sought to avoid conflict more than the Canadians, and when conflict did arise Chinese favored withdrawal or consultation with superiors

more strongly. However, Adler & Graham (1989) did find some changes in negotiators' behavior when they engaged in intercultural negotiations. Japanese negotiators achieved lower payoffs negotiating with Americans than with other Japanese. Anglophone Canadians achieved lower payoffs in negotiations with Francophone Canadians, despite the fact that the Francophones became more cooperative when negotiating interculturally. Some caution is needed in equating payoff with success in this type of study because collectivists may regard maintenance of long-term links as a more important success criterion than short-term payoff.

Three studies show how social context and understanding of the other party's preferred communication styles are crucial to successful outcome. Qualitative analyses are provided by Goldman (1994) for US-Japanese negotiations and by Kimmel (1994) for US-Iraqi negotiations prior to the Gulf War. Marriott (1993) reports how seating arrangements affected Japanese-Australian business negotiations.

## ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

### *Work Motivation*

The role of work may be expected to reflect salient dimensions of a society's values. The Meaning of Working International Team (MOW) (1987) performed surveys in the United States, Japan, and six West European countries and found so-called "work centrality" highest in Japan. The MOW study has been replicated and extended to China and six East European countries (SA Ruiz Quintanilla & GW England, submitted). The MOW team conclude that work meanings can be represented along a single axis on which, at one end, are situated the costs to the individual and, at the other end, the collective benefits of work. The Work Socialization of Youth project (WOSY) (Touzard 1992) is a longitudinal study that compares work role socialization in seven West European countries and Israel and uses the same concepts developed by the MOW team. The WOSY researchers found that changes in patterns of work meaning over the first three years at work were predicted by both individual- and country-level variables, but the researchers did not analyze their results in terms of cross-cultural theory (Claes & Ruiz Quintanilla 1993).

Misra et al (1990) found greater linkage between work and family concerns in India than in Canada. Schwalb et al (1992) found that Japanese employees reported being motivated by the task itself, self-improvement, and financial reward, in contrast with a greater US emphasis upon affiliation, social concern, and recognition. Holt & Keats (1992) compared Anglo, Chinese, Lebanese, and Aboriginal Australians. While all valued achievement highly, the degree to which achievement related to work varied greatly. These results indicate the

need for revision of the earlier view that achievement motivation is particularly strong in individualist cultures, and that individualistic entrepreneurialism is a prerequisite for economic development (McClelland 1961). Achievement motivation, at least in East Asian collectivist cultures, is more socially oriented (Yu 1995, Yu & Yang 1994), which may also foster entrepreneurial activity (Redding 1990). Whether achievement motivation centers upon work is dependent upon the values of a culture, and this variation can lead to unexpected findings. Xie & Jamal's (1993) study of Chinese managers, for example, illustrates that Type A managers reported more job stress than Type B managers, as in Western studies. However, the two groups showed no difference in psychosomatic problems, and Type A managers spent more time with their families. Thus the Western pattern of compulsive working with attendant health risks appears here to be attenuated by the centrality of family within Chinese culture.

Agarwal (1993) found positive effects of reliance on rules and normalization in handling role conflict and ambiguity among salespersons in India, but negative effects in the United States. Dubinsky et al (1992) compared role ambiguity and role conflict among salespersons in the United States, Japan, and Korea. Few effects due to culture were detected. Several researchers have examined the relation of work stress to Hofstede scores for particular countries. Shenkar & Zeira (1992) studied role ambiguity of chief executives within international joint ventures in Israel. Role ambiguity was greatest where the scores for power distance and masculinity among partners' countries were most divergent. Peterson et al (1995) surveyed managers in 21 countries and reported role overload was greatest in high power distance, collectivist nations whereas reported role ambiguity was greatest in low power distance, individualist nations.

### *Work Behavior*

Several studies discussed earlier that were designed to identify dimensions of cultural variation were based upon employees' reported values or behavior. This section considers more specific aspects of work behavior. Luthans et al (1993) made an observational study of Russian managers and compared the results to earlier studies of US managers. Although the pattern of their activities showed considerable similarities, the Russians spent less time on networking and more on planning, controlling, and coordinating. Boisot & Liang (1992) observed a small sample of Chinese managers. The managers spent more time with their superiors and received much more written material from them than was the case in earlier US studies.

Comparisons between Hong Kong and US managers have proved popular. Schermerhorn & Bond (1991) compared managers' preferred influence tactics and found Hong Kong respondents preferred assertiveness and the Americans

preferred rationality, exchange, and ingratiation. Ralston et al (1992, 1993) found Hong Kong managers rated higher for Machiavellianism, external locus of control, dogmatism, and Confucian Work Dynamism. Most of these effects were found also among mainland Chinese managers. Black & Porter (1991) compared performance appraisals received by managers in the United States and Hong Kong with managers' self-rated traits derived from US leadership theory. High correlations between traits and performance appraisals were found in the United States but were not found for either Chinese or US managers working in Hong Kong. Similar conclusions were reached by Furnham & Stringfield (1993), who found that quite different traits were significantly linked to performance measures among Chinese and European managers working for the same Hong Kong airline.

Bochner & Hesketh (1994) studied Australian bank employees whose ethnic identity was with either high (e.g. Hong Kong) or low (e.g. Great Britain) power distance cultures. The high power distance group reported significantly more behaviors likely to be expected from high power distance, collectivist cultures and reported experiencing more discrimination than did respondents from the majority, low power distance group. Wong & Birnbaum-More (1994) found that among banks in Hong Kong the degree of centralization and hierarchy could be predicted by the Hofstede power distance score of the country owning the bank.

Organizational researchers have also sought to delineate the relationship between organizational culture and national culture. Morris et al (1994) compared the incidence of entrepreneurial corporate climate in US, South African, and Portuguese organizations. Within-country analyses revealed that within the United States and South Africa, respondents' endorsement of moderate levels of individualism-collectivism was associated with the highest endorsement of entrepreneurial values. Van Muijen & Koopman (1994) report results from the FOCUS 92 group, which surveyed perceptions of organizational climate in 10 European nations. Differences in mean country scores on preference for innovation paralleled Hofstede's individualism scores, but rules-orientation did not accord with any of the Hofstede scores. Janssens et al (1995) compared perceptions of safety policy within US, French, and Argentinian plants of the same US multinational corporation. Although a company-wide policy was in force, its implementation varied in ways that were interpreted in terms of individualism-collectivism. Hofstede et al (1990) identified six dimensions of organizational culture within organizations in Denmark and the Netherlands. Hofstede et al (1993) further illustrated the importance of employing the appropriate level of data analysis in characterizing individual values, organizational culture, or national culture.

## CONCLUSIONS

Kagitcibasi & Berry (1989) concluded that three trends were apparent within the field of cross-cultural psychology in the late 1980s: a focus upon individualism-collectivism, increasing concern to develop indigenous psychologies, and the search for cultural universals. Our coverage indicates that since then the first of these issues has attracted the attention of more and more researchers. While this increased attention has served to focus cross-cultural psychology more clearly, it has led to the comparative neglect of other approaches deriving from Kagitcibasi & Berry's second and third areas. The search for universals and an emphasis upon indigenous culture-specifics are often cast as contradictory enterprises that exemplify contrasting etic and emic approaches. Yet these concepts are no more separable than nature and nurture. If the recently emerging dimensions of culture identified by Hofstede, Schwartz, Smith and others are to guide future research in fruitful directions, the methodological problems stemming from the etic-emic dilemma must be more clearly addressed.

Berry (1989) proposes a sequence in research whereby parallel indigenous studies within two or more societies may lead to a validly generalized universal or derived etic, in contrast to the currently much more widespread reliance on imposed-etic measures drawn from a small number of Western countries. Although many believe Berry's procedure is preferable, imposed-etic measures will likely continue to be much more widely used. In these circumstances, we need estimates of what types of cultural variance are missed by imposed-etic measures. Studies designed from a non-Western starting point such as the one by the Chinese Culture Connection (1987) are crucial. The increasing number of recent studies whose results compare well with already identified dimensions of cultural variation also enhance the argument for convergent validity (Bond 1995). The testing of hypotheses linking emergent dimensions of cultural values or beliefs to external-distal country-level data is another welcome trend (Best & Williams 1994; DKS Chan, submitted; Smith et al 1995a,b; Williams 1993)

However, numerous pitfalls along the path toward a well-validated framework for cross-cultural studies remain. First, this review demonstrates how the sampling of national cultures within recent studies is woefully biased. Current studies heavily overrepresent North America, East Asia, and Western Europe, with consequent neglect of Latin American, African, East European, Arab, South Asian, and other societies. Second, the strongly individualistic values of the cultures from which most researchers are drawn result in confusion regarding the appropriate levels of analysis of cross-cultural data. Most current culture-level analyses are based upon aggregation of individual-level data, and reviewers used by major North American journals rather often require that

researchers engage in individual-level data analyses, which is inappropriate to a culture-level analysis. Appropriate-level variables must be used if we are to understand variation at a given level (Hofstede et al 1993). Equally invalid extrapolations are also widespread in the reverse direction: Researchers infer that because culture X has certain values, individuals within that culture will share those values. Separate individual-level variables are needed. Schwartz's (1994) recent large-scale surveys show how individual-level analyses yield results different from culture-level analyses and provide relatively comprehensive guidelines with respect to intracultural continuities in the structure of values.

Third, how do we define the boundaries of one's cultural samples? Most studies use national affiliation, but the existing and increasing cultural diversity of many nations makes this strategy unsatisfactory. However, if future researchers routinely include measures of the salient values and ethnic identities of the samples they study, comparisons with other studies with somewhat more established theoretical roots may be made. Furthermore, the growing cultural heterogeneity both of nations and of smaller social systems within them will require that researchers progress from documenting contrasts between different cultures toward examining the ways in which individuals and groups from different cultures relate to one another. In doing so, they may broaden the cultural range encompassed by existing literatures concerning intergroup relations, stereotyping, conflict, communication, and so forth.

Although the methodological problems facing cross-cultural researchers should not be minimized, we do not wish to conclude this review on a pessimistic note. Cross-cultural social and organizational psychology has for the first time a theoretical framework upon which studies may be designed and relevant samples may be selected. That framework must be scrutinized, of course, but a set of dimensions of cultural variation proven to predict social phenomena is now available to researchers. While the definition of individualism and collectivism as polar opposites will certainly prove unable to integrate the full range of global variations in social behavior, further progress can be expected in defining just how many dimensions are required for optimal parsimony.

**Any *Annual Review* chapter, as well as any article cited in an *Annual Review* chapter, may be purchased from the Annual Reviews Preprints and Reprints service.  
1-800-347-8007; 415-259-5017; email: arpr@class.org**

*Literature Cited*

- Adair JG, Puhon BN, Vohra H. 1993. The indigenisation of psychology: empirical assessment of progress in Indian research. *Int. J. Psychol.* 28:761-73
- Adamopoulos J. 1988. Interpersonal behavior: cross-cultural and historical perspectives. See Bond 1988, pp. 196-207
- Adler NJ. 1991. *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. Boston: PWS-Kent. 2nd ed
- Adler NJ, Graham JL. 1989. Cross-cultural comparison: the international comparison fallacy. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 20:515-38
- Adler NJ, Graham JL, Schwarz T. 1987. Business negotiations in Canada, Mexico and the United States. *J. Bus. Res.* 15: 411-29
- Agarwal S. 1993. Influence of formalisation on role stress, organizational commitment and work alienation of salespersons: a cross-national comparative study. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 24:715-39
- Amir Y, Sharon I. 1987. Are social psychological laws cross-culturally valid? *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 18:383-470
- Ayman R, Chemers MM. 1991. The effect of leadership match on subordinate satisfaction in Mexican organisations: some moderating influences of self-monitoring. *Appl. Psychol.: Int. Rev.* 40:299-314
- Bass BM, Avolio B. 1993. Transformational leadership: a response to critiques. In *Leadership Theory and Research*, ed. MM Chemers, R Ayman, pp. 49-80. San Diego: Academic
- Berman JJ, Murphy-Berman V, Singh P. 1985. Cross-cultural similarities and differences in perceptions of fairness. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 16:55-67
- Berry JW. 1979. A cultural ecology of social behavior. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. L Berkowitz, 12: 177-206. New York: Academic
- Berry JW. 1989. Imposed ethics-emics-derived ethics: the operationalisation of a compelling idea. *Int. J. Psychol.* 24:721-35
- Berry JW, Poortinga YH, Segall MH, Dasen PR. 1992. *Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Berry JW, Segall MH, Kagitcibasi C, eds. 1996. *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 3, *Social Psychology, Personality and Psychopathology*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon. In press
- Best DL, Williams JE. 1994. Masculinity/femininity in the self and ideal self-descriptions of university students in fourteen countries. See Bouvy et al 1994, pp. 297-306
- Black JS, Porter LW. 1991. Managerial behaviors and job performance: a successful manager in Los Angeles may not succeed in Hong Kong. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 22:99-113
- Bochner S. 1994. Cross-cultural differences in the self concept: a test of Hofstede's individualism/collectivism distinction. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 25:273-83
- Bochner S, Hesketh B. 1994. Power distance, individualism/collectivism and job-related attitudes in a culturally-diverse work group. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 25:233-57
- Boisot M, Liang XG. 1992. The nature of managerial work in the Chinese enterprise reforms: a study of six directors. *Organ. Stud.* 13:161-84
- Bond MH, ed. 1986. *The Psychology of the Chinese People*. Hong Kong: Oxford Univ. Press
- Bond MH. 1988. *The Cross-Cultural Challenge to Social Psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Bond MH. 1991. Chinese values and health: a cross-cultural examination. *Psychol. Health* 5:137-52
- Bond MH. 1994. Trait theory and cross-cultural studies of person perception. *Psychol. Inq.* 5:114-17
- Bond MH, ed. 1995. *Handbook of Chinese Psychology*. Hong Kong: Oxford Univ. Press. In press
- Bond MH, Cheung TS. 1983. The spontaneous self-concept of college students in Hong Kong, Japan, and the United States. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 14:153-71
- Bond MH, Forgas JP. 1984. Linking person perception to behavioral intention across cultures: the role of cultural collectivism. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 15:337-52
- Bond MH, Leung K, Schwartz S. 1992. Explaining choices in procedural and distributive justice across cultures. *Int. J. Psychol.* 27:211-25
- Bond MH, Leung K, Wan KC. 1982. How does cultural collectivism operate? The impact of task and maintenance contributions on reward allocation. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 13:186-200
- Bond R, Smith PB. 1995. Culture and conformity: a meta-analysis of the Asch line judgment task. *Psychol. Bull.* In press
- Bontempo R. 1993. Translation fidelity of psychological scales: an item response theory analysis of an individualism-collectivism scale. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 24:149-66
- Bouvy AM, van de Vijver FJR, Boski P, Schmitz P, eds. 1994. *Journeys into Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger
- Brislin R. 1993. *Understanding Culture's Influence on Behavior*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich
- Buss DM, Abbott M, Angelitner A, Asherian

- A, Biaggio A, et al. 1990. International preferences in selecting mates: a study of 37 cultures. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 21: 5-47
- Campbell D, Bommer W, Yeo E. 1993. Perceptions of appropriate leadership style: participation versus consultation across two cultures. *Asia Pac. J. Manage.* 10:1-19
- Campbell N, Graham JL, Jolibert A, Meissner HG. 1988. Marketing negotiations in France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. *J. Mark.* 52:49-62
- Chan SCN, Bond MH. 1995. *Cultural values and social health*. Presented at Eur. Congr. Psychol., Athens
- Chang YC, Lin W, Lohnstamm GA. 1994. *Parents' free descriptions of children's characteristics—a verified study of the Big Five in Chinese children*. Presented at Int. Soc. Stud. Behav. Dev., Beijing
- Chasiotis A, Keller H. 1994. Evolutionary psychology and developmental cross-cultural psychology. See Bouvy et al 1994, pp. 6-82
- Chen CC. 1995. New trends in rewards allocation preferences: a Sino-US comparison. *Acad. Manage. J.* 38:408-28
- Cheng C, Bond MH, Chan SC. 1995. The perception of ideal best friends by Chinese adolescents. *Int. J. Psychol.* 30:91-108
- Chinese Culture Connection. 1987. Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 18:143-64
- Claes R, Ruiz Quintanilla SA. 1993. Work meaning patterns in early career. *Eur. Work Organ. Psychol.* 3:311-23
- Clemence A, Doise W, Rosa AS, Gonzalez L. 1995. La representation sociale des droits de l'homme: une recherche internationale sur l'etendue et les limites de l'universalite. *Int. J. Psychol.* In press
- Costa PT Jr, McCrae RR. 1992. Four ways five factors are basic. *Pers. Individ. Diff.* 13: 653-65
- Cox T, Lobel S, McLeod PL. 1991. Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Acad. Manage. J.* 34:827-47
- Crittenden KS. 1995. Causal attribution processes among the Chinese. See Bond 1995
- Crocker J, Luhtanen R, Blaine B, Broadnax S. 1994. Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 20:503-13
- Cunningham MR. 1986. Measuring the physical in physical attractiveness: quasi-experiments on the sociology of female facial beauty. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 50:925-35
- DeGooyer MJ, Williams JE. 1992. A comparison of self-concepts in Japan and the United States. See Iwawaki et al 1992, pp. 279-88
- Der-Kerabetian A. 1992. World-mindedness and the nuclear threat: a multinational study. *J. Soc. Behav. Pers.* 7:293-303
- Dion KK, Dion KL. 1991. Psychological individualism and romantic love. *J. Soc. Behav. Pers.* 6:17-33
- Dion KK, Dion KL. 1993. Individualistic and collectivistic perspectives on gender and the cultural context of love and intimacy. *J. Soc. Issues* 49:53-69
- Dion KL, Dion KK. 1993. Gender and ethnocultural comparisons in styles of love. *Psychol. Women Q.* 17:463-73
- Dixon RMW. 1977. Where have all the adjectives gone? *Stud. Lang.* 1:19-80
- Doise W, Dell' Ambrogio P, Spini D. 1991. Psychologie sociale et Droits del' Homme. *Rev. Int. Psychol. Soc.* 4:257-77
- Doise W, Spini D, Jesuino JC, Ng SH, Emler N. 1994. Values and perceived conflicts in the social representations of human rights: feasibility of a cross-national study. *Swiss J. Psychol.* 53:240-51
- Dorfman PW. 1995. International and cross-cultural leadership research. See Punnett & Shenkar 1995
- Dubinsky A, Michaels RE, Kotabe M, Lim CU, Moon HC. 1992. Influence of role stress on industrial salespeople's work outcomes in the United States, Japan and Korea. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 23:77-99
- Earley PC. 1989. Social loafing and collectivism: a comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 34:565-81
- Earley PC. 1993. East meets West meets Mideast: further explorations of collectivistic and individualistic work groups. *Acad. Manage. J.* 36:319-48
- Earley PC. 1994. Self or group: cultural effects of training on self-efficacy and performance. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 39:89-117
- Earley PC, Erez M, eds. 1996. *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. In press
- Earley PC, Mosakowski E. 1995. A framework for understanding experimental research in an international and intercultural context. See Punnett & Shenkar 1995
- Easton D, Shelling CS, eds. 1991. *Divided Knowledge: Across Disciplines, Across Cultures*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Ellis BB, Becker P, Kimmel HD. 1993. An item response theory evaluation of an English version of the Trier Personality Inventory (TPI). *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 24: 133-48
- Ellis BB, Kimmel HD, Diaz Guerrero R, Canas J, Bajo MT. 1995. Love and power in Mexico, Spain and the United States. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 25:525-40
- Ellsworth PC. 1994. Sense, culture, sensibility. See Kitayama & Markus 1994, pp. 23-50

- Erez M, Earley PC. 1993. *Culture, Self-Identity and Work*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Feather NT. 1988. From values to actions: recent applications of the expectancy-value model. *Aust. J. Psychol.* 40:105-24
- Feather NT. 1994. Values, national identification and in-group favouritism. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 33:467-76
- Feather NT, McKee IR. 1993. Global self-esteem and attitudes toward the high achiever for Australian and Japanese students. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* 56:65-76
- Fernandez Dols JP. 1992. Procesos escabrosos en psicología social: el concepto de norma perversa. *Rev. Psicol. Soc.* 7:243-55
- Fiedler FE, Chemers MM. 1984. *Improving Leadership Effectiveness: The Leader Match Concept*. New York: Wiley
- Fiske AP. 1992. The four elementary forms of sociality: framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychol. Rev.* 99: 689-723
- Fiske AP. 1993. Social errors in four cultures: evidence about universal forms of social relations. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 24: 463-94
- Frijda NH, Mesquita B. 1994. The social roles and functions of emotions. See Kitayama & Markus 1994, pp. 51-87
- Furnham A. 1993. Just world beliefs in twelve societies. *J. Soc. Psychol.* 133:317-29
- Furnham A, Bond MH, Heaven P, Hilton D, Lobel T, et al. 1993. A comparison of Protestant work ethic beliefs in thirteen nations. *J. Soc. Psychol.* 133:185-97
- Furnham A, Stringfield P. 1993. Personality and occupational behavior: Myers-Briggs Type indicator correlates of managerial practices in two cultures. *Hum. Relat.* 46: 827-48
- Furnham A, Stringfield P. 1994. Congruence of self and subordinate ratings of managerial practices as a correlate of supervisor evaluation. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 67: 57-68
- Gabrenya WK. 1988. Social science and social psychology: the cross-cultural link. See Bond 1988, pp. 48-66
- Gabrenya WK. 1990. *Dyadic social interaction during task behavior in collectivist and individualist societies*. Presented at Workshop on Individualism-Collectivism, Seoul, Korea
- Gerstner CR, Day DV. 1994. Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadersh. Q.* 5:121-34
- Gielen UP. 1994. American mainstream psychology and its relationship to international and cross-cultural psychology. In *Advancing Psychology and Its Applications: International Perspectives*, ed. AL Comunian, UP Gielen, pp. 26-40. Milan: Angel
- Giles HA, Viladot A. 1994. Ethnolinguistic differentiation in Catalonia. *Multilingua: J. Cross-Cult. Interlang. Commun.* 13: 301-12
- Goldman A. 1994. The centrality of 'ningen-sei' to Japanese negotiating and interpersonal relationships: implications for US-Japanese communication. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 18:29-54
- Goodwin R, Tang D. 1991. Preferences for friends and close relationship partners. *J. Soc. Psychol.* 131:579-81
- Graham JL, Evenko LI, Rajan MN. 1992. An empirical comparison of Soviet and American business negotiations. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 23:387-418
- Graham JL, Kim DK, Lin CY, Robinson R. 1988. Buyer-seller negotiations around the Pacific Rim: differences in fundamental exchange processes. *J. Consum. Res.* 15: 48-54
- Gudykunst WB, ed. 1993. *Communication in Japan and the United States*. Albany: S. Univ. NY
- Gudykunst WB, Matsumoto Y, Ting-Toomey S, Nishida T, Karimi H. 1994. *Measuring self-construals across cultures: a derived-etic analysis*. Int. Commun. Assoc., Sydney
- Hatfield E, Rapson RL. 1993. Historical and cross-cultural perspectives on passionate love and sexual desire. *Annu. Rev. Sex Res.* 4:67-97
- Ho EKF. 1994. *Validating the five-factor model of personality*. BA thesis. Chinese Univ. Hong Kong
- Hofstede G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Hofstede G, Bond MH, Luk CL. 1993. Individual perceptions of organisational cultures: a methodological treatise on levels of analysis. *Organ. Stud.* 14:483-503
- Hofstede G, Neuyen B, Ohayv DD, Sanders G. 1990. Measuring organizational cultures: a qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 35:286-316
- Hogan RT, Emler NP. 1978. The biases in contemporary social psychology. *Soc. Res.* 45: 478-534
- Holt J, Keats DM. 1992. Work cognitions in multicultural interaction. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 23:421-43
- Howell JP, Dorfman PW, Hibino S, Lee JK, Tate U. 1995. Leadership in Western and Asian countries: commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes and substitutes across cultures. Las Cruces: New Mex. State Univ.
- Hui CH, Triandis HC. 1989. Effects of culture and response format on extreme response style. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 20:296-309
- Humana C. 1992. *World Human Rights Guide*. New York: Oxford
- Industrial Democracy in Europe International Research Group. 1993. *Industrial Democ-*

- racy in Europe Revisited. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Ip GWM, Bond MH. 1995. Culture, values, and the spontaneous self-concept. *Asian J. Psychol.* 1:30-36
- Iwawaki S, Kashima Y, Leung K, eds. 1992. *Innovations in Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger
- Jago AG, Reber G, Bohnisch W, Maczynski J, Zavrel J, et al. 1993. *Culture's consequence? A seven nation study of participation*. Presented at Decis. Sci. Inst., Washington, DC
- Janssens M, Brett J, Smith FJ. 1995. Confirmatory cross-cultural research: testing the viability of a corporate-wide safety policy. *Acad. Manage. J.* 38:364-82
- Kagitcibasi C, Berry JW. 1989. Cross-cultural psychology: current research and trends. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 40:493-531
- Kagitcibasi C. 1995. *Family and Human Development Across Cultures: A View from the Other Side*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Kashima Y, Siegel M, Tanaka K, Kashima ES. 1992. Do people believe behaviors are consistent with attitudes? Towards a cultural psychology of attribution processes. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 31:111-24
- Kashima Y, Triandis HC. 1986. The self-serving bias in attributions as a coping strategy: a cross-cultural study. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 17:83-97
- Keats DM, Munro D, Mann L. 1989. *Heterogeneity in Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger
- Kim U, Berry JW, eds. 1993. *Indigenous Psychologies: Research and Experience in Context*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Kim U, Triandis HC, Kagitcibasi C, Choi SC, Yoon G, eds. 1994. *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Kimmel PR. 1994. Cultural perspectives on international negotiations. *J. Soc. Issues* 50: 179-96
- Kitayama S, Markus HR, eds. 1994. *Emotion and Culture: Empirical Studies of Mutual Influence*. Washington, DC: Am. Psychol. Assoc.
- Komin S. 1990. Culture and work-related values in Thai organisations. *Int. J. Psychol.* 25:681-704
- Kohn ML. 1987. Cross-national research as an analytic strategy. *Am. Soc. Rev.* 52: 713-31
- Kohn ML, Schoonbach C, Schooler C, Slomczynski KM. 1990. Position in the class structure and psychological functioning in the United States, Japan and Poland. *Am. J. Soc.* 95:964-1008
- Krewer B, Jahoda G. 1993. Psychologie et culture: vers une solution de Babel? *Int. J. Psychol.* 28:367-76
- Latané B, Williams K, Harkins S. 1979. Many hands make light the work: causes and consequences of social loafing. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 37:822-32
- Leung JP, Leung K. 1992. Life satisfaction, self-concept and relationship with parents in adolescence. *J. Youth Adolesc.* 21: 653-65
- Leung K. 1995a. Beliefs in Chinese culture. See Bond 1995
- Leung K. 1995b. Negotiation and reward allocations across cultures. See Earley & Erez 1996
- Leung K, Bond MH. 1989. On the empirical identification of dimensions for cross-cultural comparison. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 20:133-51
- Leung K, Bond MH, Schwartz S. 1994. *How To Explain Cross-Cultural Differences: Values, Valences and Expectancies?* Hong Kong: Chinese Univ.
- Levine R, Sato S, Hashimoto T, Verma J. 1995. Love and marriage in eleven cultures. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* In press
- Linssen H, Hagendoorn L. 1994. Social and geographic factors in the explanation of the content of European nationality stereotypes. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 33:165-82
- Liston A, Salts CJ. 1988. Mate selection values: a comparison of Malaysian and United States students. *J. Comp. Fam. Stud.* 19: 361-70
- Lonner WJ. 1980. The search for psychological universals. See Triandis & Lambert 1980, pp. 143-204
- Lonner WJ, Malpass R, eds. 1994. *Psychology and Culture*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Luhtanen R, Crocker J. 1992. A collective self-esteem scale: self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 18: 302-18
- Luk CL, Bond MH. 1992. Chinese lay beliefs about the causes and cures of psychological problems. *J. Clin. Soc. Psychol.* 11: 140-57
- Luthans F, Welsh DHB, Rosenkrantz SA. 1993. What do Russian managers really do? An observational study with comparisons to US managers. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 24: 741-61
- Lytle A, Brett JM, Barsness ZI, Tinsley CH, Janssens M. 1995. A paradigm for confirmatory cross-cultural research in organizational behavior. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 17: 167-214
- Marin G, Gamba RJ, Marin BV. 1993. Extreme response style and acquiescence among Hispanics: the role of acculturation and education. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 23:498-509
- Marin G, Marin BV. 1991. *Research with Hispanic Populations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Markus HR, Kitayama S. 1991. Culture and the self: implications for cognition, emo-

- tion and motivation. *Psychol. Rev.* 98: 224-53
- Marriott H. 1993. Spatial arrangements in Australian-Japanese business communication. *J. Asian Pac. Commun.* 4:107-26
- Matsui T, Kakuyama T, Onglatco ML. 1987. Effects of goals and feedback on performance in groups. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 72: 407-15
- Matsumoto D. 1994. *People: Psychology from a Cultural Perspective*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Matsumoto D, Kudoh T. 1993. American-Japanese cultural differences in attributions of personality based on smiles. *J. Nonverbal Behav.* 17:231-43
- Mauro R, Sato K, Tucker J. 1992. The role of appraisal in human emotions: a cross-cultural study. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 62: 301-17
- McArthur LZ, Berry DS. 1987. Cross-cultural agreement in perceptions of babyfaced adults. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 18:165-92
- McClelland DC. 1961. *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand
- Merritt AC, Helmreich RL. 1995. Human factors on the flightdeck: the influence of national culture. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* In press
- Mesquita B. 1993. *Cultural variations in emotions: a comparative study of Dutch, Surinamese and Turkish people in the Netherlands*. PhD thesis. Univ. Amsterdam
- Mesquita B, Frijda NH. 1992. Cultural variations in emotions: a review. *Psychol. Bull.* 412:179-204
- Messick DM. 1988. On the limitations of cross-cultural research in social psychology. See Bond 1988, pp. 41-47
- Miller JG. 1994. Cultural diversity in the morality of caring: individually oriented versus duty-based interpersonal moral codes. *Cross-Cult. Res.* 28:3-39
- Miller JG, Bersoff DM. 1992. Culture and moral judgment. How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibilities resolved? *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 62: 541-54
- Misra S, Gergen K. 1993. On the place of culture in psychological science. *Int. J. Psychol.* 28:225-44
- Misra S, Ghosh R, Kanungo RN. 1990. Measurement of family involvement: a cross-national study of managers. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 21:232-48
- Misumi J. 1985. *The Behavioral Science of Leadership*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Moghaddam FM, Taylor DM, Wright SC. 1993. *Social Psychology in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Freeman
- Montepare JM, Zebrowitz LA. 1993. A cross-cultural comparison of impressions created by age-related variations in gait. *J. Nonverbal Behav.* 17:55-68
- Morris MH, Davis DL, Allen JW. 1994. Fostering corporate entrepreneurship: cross-cultural comparisons of the importance of individualism versus collectivism. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 25:65-89
- Morris MW, Peng KP. 1994. Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 67:949-71
- Murphy G. 1969. Psychology in the year 2000. *Am. Psychol.* 24:523-30
- Newman LS. 1993. How individualists interpret behavior: idiocentrism and spontaneous trait inference. *Soc. Cogn.* 11:243-69
- Okechuku C. 1994. The relationship of six managerial characteristics to the assessment of managerial effectiveness in Canada, Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 67: 79-86
- Ongel U, Smith PB. 1994. Who are we and where are we going? JCCP approaches its 100th issue. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 25: 25-53
- Pandey J, Sinha D, Bhawuk DPS, eds. 1995. *Asian Contributions to Cross-Cultural Psychology*. New Delhi: Sage
- Paranjpe AC, Ho DYF, Rieber RW, eds. 1988. *Asian Contributions to Psychology*. New York: Praeger
- Peng Y, Zebrowitz LA, Lee HK. 1993. The impact of cultural background and cross-cultural experience on impressions of American and Korean speakers. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 24:203-20
- Perrett DI, May KA, Yoshikawa S. 1994. Facial shape and judgments of female attractiveness. *Nature* 368:239-42
- Peterson MF, Smith PB, Bond MH, Misumi J. 1990. Personal reliance on alternative event management processes in four countries. *Group Organ. Stud.* 15:75-91
- Peterson MF, Smith PB, Akande D, Ayestaran S, Bochner S, et al. 1995. Role stress by national culture and organizational function: a 21 nation study. *Acad. Manage. J.* 38:429-52
- Poortinga Y. 1992. Towards a conceptualization of culture for psychology. See Iwawaki et al 1992, pp. 3-17
- Punnett BJ, Shenkar O, eds. 1995. *Handbook of International Management Research*. Oxford: Blackwell. In press
- Radford MH, Mann L, Ohta Y, Nakane Y. 1991. Differences between Australia and Japan in reported use of decision processes. *Int. J. Psychol.* 26:35-52
- Radford MH, Mann L, Ohta Y, Nakane Y. 1993. Differences between Australian and Japanese students in decisional self-esteem, decisional stress and coping styles. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 24:284-97
- Rai SN, Rathore J. 1988. Attraction as a function of cultural similarity and proportion of

- similar attitudes related to different areas of life. *Psychol. Ling.* 18:47-57
- Ralston DA, Gustafson DJ, Elsacs PM, Cheung FM, Terpstra RH. 1992. Eastern values: a comparison of managers in the United States, Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 77: 664-71
- Ralston DA, Gustafson DJ, Terpstra RH, Holt DH, Cheung FM, et al. 1993. The impact of managerial values on decision-making behavior: a comparison of the United States and Hong Kong. *Asia. Pac. J. Manage.* 10:21-37
- Redding SG. 1990. *The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism*. Berlin: de Gruyter
- Rodrigues A, Iwawaki S. 1986. Testing the validity of different models of interpersonal balance in the Japanese culture. *Psychologia* 29:123-31
- Rosenthal DA, Feldman SS. 1992. The nature and stability of ethnic identity in Chinese youth: effects of length of residence in two cultural contexts. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 23:214-27
- Rosenzweig MR. 1992. *International Psychological Science: Progress, Problems and Prospects*. Washington, DC: Am. Psychol. Assoc.
- Rotter JB. 1966. Generalised expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychol. Monogr.* 80:(Whole No. 609)
- Russell DW. 1982. The Causal Dimension Scale: a measure of how individuals perceive causes. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 42: 1137-45
- Russell JA. 1994. Is there universal recognition of emotion from facial expression? A review of the cross-cultural studies. *Psychol. Bull.* 115:102-41
- Schermerhorn JR, Bond MH. 1991. Upward and downward influence tactics in managerial networks: a comparative study of Hong Kong Chinese and Americans. *Asia Pac. J. Manage.* 8:147-58
- Schmidt SM, Yeh RS. 1992. The structure of leader influence: a cross-national comparison. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 23:251-64
- Schwalb DW, Schwalb BJ, Harnisch DL, Maehr ML, Akabane K. 1992. Personal investment in Japan and the USA: a study of worker motivation. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 16:107-24
- Schwartz SH. 1992. The universal content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In *Advanced Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. MP Zanna, 25:1-65. New York: Academic
- Schwartz SH. 1994. Beyond individualism/collectivism: new cultural dimensions of values. See Kim et al 1994, pp. 85-119
- Segall MH, Dasen PR, Berry JW, Poortinga YH. 1990. *Human Behavior in Global Perspective: An Introduction to Cross-Cultural Psychology*. New York: Pergamon
- Shavelson RJ, Bolus R. 1982. Self-concept: the interplay of theory and methods. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 74:3-17
- Shaver PR, Wu S, Schwartz JC. 1991. Cross-cultural similarities and differences in emotion and its representation: a prototype approach. In *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, ed. MS Clark, 13: 175-212. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Shenkar O, von Glinow MA. 1994. Paradoxes in organizational theory and research: using the case of China to illustrate national contingency. *Manage. Sci.* 40:56-71
- Shenkar O, Zeira Y. 1992. Role conflict and role ambiguity of chief executive officers in international joint ventures. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 23:55-75
- Shweder RA, Bourne EJ. 1982. Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In *Cultural Conceptions of Mental Health and Therapy*, ed. AJ Marsella, GM White, pp. 97-137. Dordrecht: Reidel
- Shweder RA, Sullivan MA. 1993. Cultural psychology: Who needs it? *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 44:497-523
- Singelis TM. 1994. The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 20:580-91
- Singelis TM, Sharkey WF. 1995. Culture, self-construal and embarrassment. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* In press
- Singelis TM, Triandis HC, Bhawuk DW, Gelfand M. 1995. Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: a theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cult. Res.* 29:240-75
- Smith PB, Bond MH. 1994. *Social Psychology Across Cultures: Analysis and Perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Smith PB, Dugan S, Trompenaars F. 1995a. National culture and managerial values: a dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* In press
- Smith PB, Misumi J, Tayeb MH, Peterson MF, Bond MH. 1989. On the generality of leadership styles across cultures. *J. Occup. Psychol.* 62:97-110
- Smith PB, Peterson MF. 1988. *Leadership, Organizations and Culture: An Event Management Model*. London: Sage
- Smith PB, Peterson MF, Akande D, Callan V, Cho NG, et al. 1994a. Organizational event management in 14 countries: a comparison with Hofstede's dimensions. See Bouvy et al 1994, pp. 364-73
- Smith PB, Peterson MF, Misumi J. 1994b. Event management and work team effectiveness in Japan, Britain and the USA. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 67:33-44
- Smith PB, Peterson MF, Misumi J, Bond MH. 1992. A cross-cultural test of Japanese PM

- leadership theory. *Appl. Psychol.: Int. Rev.* 41:5-19
- Smith PB, Trompenaars F, Dugan S. 1995b. The Rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries: a test of cultural relativity. *Int. J. Psychol.* 30:377-400
- Soudjin KA, Hutschmaekers GTM, Van de Vijver FJR. 1990. Culture conceptualizations. In *The Investigation of Culture: Current Issues in Cultural Psychology*, ed. FJR van de Vijver, GTM Hutschmaekers, pp. 19-39. Tilburg, Holland: Tilburg Univ. Press
- Taylor SE, Brown JD. 1988. Illusion and well-being: a social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychol. Bull.* 103: 193-210
- Ting-Toomey S, Yee-Jung KK, Shapiro RB, Garcia W. 1994. *Ethnic identity salience and conflict styles in four ethnic groups: African Americans, Asian Americans, European Americans, and Latino Americans*. Presented at Annu. Meet. Speech Commun. Assoc., New Orleans
- Touzard H, ed. 1992. *Int. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* 5(1):whole issue
- Triandis HC. 1984. Toward a psychological theory of economic growth. *Int. J. Psychol.* 19:79-95
- Triandis HC. 1990. Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In *Nebraska Symposium Motivation, 1989*, ed. JJ Berman, 37:41-134. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press
- Triandis HC. 1993. Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cult. Res.* 27:155-80
- Triandis HC. 1994. *Culture and Social Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Triandis HC. 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview
- Triandis HC, Dunning M, Hough LM, eds. 1993a. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 4, *Cross-Cultural Studies*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists. 2nd ed.
- Triandis HC, McCusker C, Betancourt H, Iwao S, Leung K, et al. 1993b. An emic-etic analysis of individualism-collectivism. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 24:366-83
- Triandis HC, Lambert WW, eds. 1980. *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 1, *Perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Trompenaars F. 1993. *Riding the Waves of Culture*. London: Brealey
- Trubisky P, Ting-Toomey S, Lin SL. 1991. The influence of individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 15:65-84
- Tse DK, Francis J, Walls J. 1994. Cultural differences in conducting intra- and inter-cultural negotiations: a Sino-Canadian comparison. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 25:537-55
- Tse DK, Lee KH, Vertinsky I, Wehrung DA. 1988. Does culture matter? A cross-cultural study of executives' choice, decisiveness and risk adjustment in international marketing. *J. Mark.* 52:81-95
- Tyler TR, Bies RJ. 1990. Beyond formal procedures: the interpersonal context of procedural justice. In *Applied Social Psychology and Organizational Settings*, ed. JS Carroll, pp. 77-98. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Tyler TR, Lind EA, Huo YJ. 1995. Culture and reactions to authority: influence of situational and dispositional factors. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* In press
- van de Vijver FJR, Leung K. 1996. Methods and data analytic procedures in cross-cultural research. See Berry et al 1996
- van Muijen J, Koopman P. 1994. The influence of national culture on organizational culture: a comparative study between ten countries. *Eur. Work Organ. Psychol.* In press
- Wang ZM, Heller FA. 1993. Patterns of power distribution and managerial decision-making in Chinese and British industrial organizations. *Int. J. Hum. Res. Manage.* 4: 113-28
- Watkins D, Cheng C. 1995. The Revised Causal Attribution Scale: a confirmatory factor analysis with Hong Kong subjects. *Br. J. Educ. Psychol.* 65:249-52
- Watkins D, Dong Q. 1994. Assessing the self-esteem of Chinese school children. *Educ. Psychol.* 14:129-37
- Watson WE, Kumar K. 1992. Differences in decision-making regarding risk-taking: a comparison of culturally diverse and culturally homogeneous task groups. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 16:53-65
- Watson WE, Kumar K, Michaelsen LK. 1993. Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Acad. Manage. J.* 36:590-602
- Weinreich P. 1986. The operationalization of identity theory in racial and ethnic relations. In *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*, ed. J Rex, D Mason, pp. 299-324. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Weinreich P. 1995. Operationalization of ethnic identity: illustrative case studies of orientations to the European Community. In *National Identities in Europe: Problems and Controversies*, ed. E Sönsa. Lisbon: Portuguese Comm. to EC/ISPA. In press
- Weinreich P, Luk C, Bond MH. 1994. *Ethnic identity: identification with other cultures, self-esteem and identity confusion*. Int. Conf. Immigr., Lang. Acquis., Patterns Soc. Integr., Jerusalem
- Williams JE. 1993. *Young adults' views of aging: a 19 nation study*. Presented at Inter-Am. Soc. Psychol. Congr., Santiago, Chile
- Williams JE, Best D. 1990. *Sex and Psyche:*

- Gender and Self Viewed Cross-Culturally*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Williams JE, Saiz JL, FormyDuval DL, Munick ML, Fogle EE, et al. 1995. Cross-cultural variation in the importance of psychological characteristics: a seven country study. *Int. J. Psychol.* In press
- Wong GYY, Birnbaum-More M. 1994. Culture, context and structure: a test on Hong Kong banks. *Organ. Stud.* 15:99-123
- Wu S, Shaver PR. 1992. *Conceptions of love in the United States and the People's Republic of China*. Presented at Int. Soc. Study Pers. Relat., 6th, Orono, ME
- Xie JL, Jamal M. 1993. The Type A experiences: stress, job-related attitudes and non-work behavior: a study of managers in China. *Int. J. Manage.* 10:351-60
- Yang KS, Ho DYF. 1988. The role of *yuan* in Chinese social life: a conceptual and empirical analysis. See Paranjpe et al 1988, pp. 163-81
- Yates JF, Lee JW. 1995. Chinese decision-making. See Bond 1995
- Yu AB. 1995. Ultimate Chinese concern, self, and achievement motivation. See Bond 1995
- Yu AB, Yang KS. 1994. The nature of achievement motivation in collectivist societies. See Kim et al 1994, pp. 239-50
- Zebrowitz-McArthur L. 1988. Person perception in cross-cultural perspective. See Bond 1988, pp. 245-65