

A CROSS-NATIONAL STUDY OF MANAGERIAL VALUES

William J. Bigoness*

University of North Carolina

Gerald L. Blakely**

West Virginia University

Abstract. This study investigated cross-national differences in managerial values. A total of 567 managers from twelve nations participated in the study. Managerial values were assessed by means of Rokeach's Value Survey. Factor analysis of the eighteen instrumental values included in Rokeach's Value Survey revealed four underlying value dimensions. The value dimension that included the instrumental values broadminded, capable and courageous was ranked as the most important value dimension by managers from all twelve nations. National differences were found on three of the four value dimensions.

As business has become increasingly global, the transferability of management theories and practices across national borders and different cultures has become an increasingly debated topic [Adler and Jelinek 1986; Black and Porter 1991; Cox and Cooper 1985; Hofstede 1993; Laurent 1983]. Increasingly, researchers and practitioners are concluding that the exportability of management theories and practices is determined by the comparability of the cultural values between the exporting and importing nation. As Erez [1986] noted a decade ago, societal values, managerial practices and the congruence between the two sets has increasingly been shown to influence critical organizational outcomes.

During the past decade, a number of studies have supported Erez's congruence argument. Earley [1989], for example, found that social loafing occurred in an individualistic group comprised primarily of Americans but not in a collectivistic group comprised primarily of Chinese. Morris and Pavett [1992] found that a Likert [1967] System 2 style of management was quite productive in

*William J. Bigoness is Professor of Business Administration at the Kenan-Flagler Business School at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. He received his Ph.D. degree in management from Michigan State University. His research interests include human resource management, international management and labor-management relations.

**Gerald L. Blakely is Associate Professor of Management at West Virginia University. He received his Ph.D. in management from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. His research interests include organizational behavior and human resource management.

We gratefully thank Gary D. Gady and Tracey Honycutt Sigler for their assistance with the statistical analysis contained in this paper.

Received: February 1994; Revised: January & September 1996; Accepted: September 1996.

Mexico whereas a System 3 style of management was quite productive in the United States. They concluded that their findings were due to the congruence between the management systems and cultures in the two locations. In a Russian textile factory Welsh, Luthans and Sommer [1993] found extrinsic rewards and behavioral management had significant, positive effects on performance. However, a participative management technique led to a decrease in performance. Again, cultural factors, particularly the communal values of Russian factory workers, were offered as an explanation to this latter finding. Finally, a number of other management processes or outcomes have been found to be affected by culture, including the transfer of technology [Kedia and Bhagat 1988], organizational development [Jaeger 1986], and negotiation [Shenkar and Ronen 1987].

Research designed to assess the degree to which nations differ in terms of attitudes, beliefs and values has resulted in widely different findings. Hofstede [1980], after surveying employees of a major United States multinational in forty countries, reported significant national differences across four dimensions of culture which he labeled power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity. For instance, United States employees reported the highest national mean on individualism, above the mean on masculinity, and below the means on power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Employees from the Netherlands, on the other hand, were high in individualism, below the means on power distance and uncertainty avoidance, and very low on masculinity.

Kanungo and Wright [1983] found that British managers placed greater importance on individual achievement and autonomy than did French managers, whereas French managers placed greater importance on competent supervision, sound company policies, fringe benefits, security, and comfortable working conditions. Dowling and Nagel [1986] found that business majors in the United States placed greater emphasis on self-fulfillment, responsibility, and other intrinsic rewards, while Australian business majors stressed extrinsic factors. Finally, Howard, Shudo and Umeshima [1983] found that American managers valued individuality, while Japanese managers valued socially oriented qualities.

Attitudes toward business practices and priorities have also been found to differ by nationality. Bass and Eldridge [1973] found that successful managers in the United States, the United Kingdom and Germany placed a heavy emphasis on the profit-making motive. Successful managers in Denmark, however, were found to place a greater emphasis on societal concerns in making managerial decisions. Yasin, Zimmerer and Green [1989] found that Kuwaiti managers were more likely than American managers to make business decisions consistent with their own personal goals. Swedish managers were found by Laurent [1983] to express little reluctance in bypassing the hierarchical line, while Italian managers believed that bypassing the hierarchical

line was a serious offense warranting either reprimanding the employee or redesigning the hierarchical structure.

Not all studies, however, have supported significant national differences in attitudes, work goals, or values. For example, Harpaz [1990] found little difference in the work goals of employees from seven industrialized nations. Schwind and Peterson [1985] reported that the values of Japanese manager trainees were more similar to United States management students than to Japanese managers. In a study of value differences between managers from the United States, Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China, Ralston, Gustafson, Elsass, Cheung, and Terpstra [1992] found greater individual variance than between-nation variance.

Heiskanen [1985] noted that although, the importance of cross-national studies has increasingly been recognized, the accumulation of knowledge leaves much to be desired. Methodological limitations of many previous studies are a major factor contributing to our lack of knowledge pertaining to cross-national differences. Common methodological limitations include: 1) many studies are limited to only a few nations that are often culturally similar; 2) target populations vary from one study to the next; 3) samples are often not representative of the population of interest; and 4) studies are limited to a single company.

Ralston et al. [1992] noted that understanding managers' values is critical in a global economy, since the business philosophy of a given country depends, to a large degree, upon the values held by those in management. Furthermore, as Tung and Miller [1990] observed, understanding the values of the people with whom one is engaged in business is an important step in building a good cross-national working relationship.

The present study investigated national differences in managerial values. In conducting this study, the authors sought to overcome a number of the methodological limitations of earlier studies. Specifically, the present investigation involved managers from twelve nations, the populations sampled were highly comparable, and they represented managers from many different companies.

The present study focused on managerial values rather than attitudes because, according to Rokeach [1968], values are fewer in number than attitudes, represent a broader preference and are more enduring than attitudes, and "... a value, unlike an attitude, is a standard or yardstick to guide actions, comparisons, evaluations, and justifications of self and others" (p. 160).

METHOD

Sample and Procedures

Participants in this study were graduates of management development

programs sponsored by the International Management Development Institute (IMD). Founded in 1957 and located in Lausanne, Switzerland, IMD specializes in offering practically-oriented general management development programs. Program participants are almost exclusively middle- and upper-level managers. Management programs offered by IMD vary in length from two weeks to one year. IMD's management programs are conducted exclusively in English and all program participants must be fluent in English. Annually, participants attending IMD programs represent approximately fifty different nations. A majority of participants are from Western European nations.

As part of a larger research project, the authors surveyed all living alumni. A total of 3,949 questionnaires were sent to IMD alumni throughout the world. Enclosed with the questionnaire was a cover letter encouraging alumni to complete and return the questionnaire. A preaddressed return envelope was included with the questionnaire. Respondents were assured that their responses would be confidential. Participants were also told they would receive a copy of the major findings of the alumni survey.

A total of 1,056 IMD alumni from forty-seven different countries returned completed questionnaires, resulting in a 27% response rate. In many cases the number of respondents from selected countries was too small for the purposes of statistical analysis. Countries with fewer than twenty respondents were not included in the present analysis. This procedure resulted in a sample size of 567 from twelve different nations. The twelve nations included in this study were Australia, Brazil, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United States. The age of these respondents ranged from 26 to 68 with a mean of 48 and a standard deviation of 8.38. Seventy-six percent of respondents possessed either a university degree or a graduate degree. Ninety-four percent of respondents were male.

Instrument

Included within the alumni questionnaire were items pertaining to career progression, industry of employment, demographic questions, general job satisfaction, and perceived value of their IMD experience. Also included within the questionnaire was a copy of Rokeach's Value Survey [1973].

The eighteen instrumental values included in the Rokeach Value Survey were included in the questionnaire, while the eighteen terminal values were omitted. Terminal values are preferences for certain end-states, while instrumental values deal with modes of conduct. Because instrumental values deal with matters of conduct, it was felt that instrumental values would be more relevant to the adoptability of selected management practices. In addition, concerns pertaining to the length of the questionnaire precluded including questions about both terminal and instrumental values.

Recent research by Hofstede and Bond [1988] and Lee [1991] has shown that

while the Rokeach instrument is an effective instrument for assessing key values within Western societies, it may omit important values within Eastern societies. Given that ten of the twelve nations included in this study were Western societies, and the fact that the Rokeach instrument has been found to be a valid but not fully comprehensive instrument for measuring values within Eastern societies, the authors felt the Rokeach instrument was an appropriate instrument for this study.

The instrument listed eighteen values as desired ways of behaving. Participants were asked to rank order the eighteen values in order of importance to them as guiding principles in their lives. Test-retest reliabilities of the Rokeach Value Survey have been consistently satisfactory, and value profiles have corresponded with occupational categories, race, political party, and attitudes on major social issues [1973]. While ipsative measures such as rank ordering used in the Rokeach Value Survey do limit analytical possibilities, Miethe's [1985] comparison with several alternative value measurement techniques demonstrated that the ranking method for measuring values was psychometrically superior. Other means of measuring values, such as rating scales, may suffer from social desirability response bias and consequently fail to distinguish between values [Ravlin and Meglino 1987].

RESULTS

To identify underlying value dimensions, participants' responses to the eighteen-item instrumental value questionnaire were factor analyzed using a principal component and varimax rotated solution. Although the data analyzed here are rank-order data, Tabachnick and Fidell [1989] among others maintain that rank-order data can be analyzed through multivariate techniques if a reasonably large number of ranks is assigned, and if the variable has a linear relationship with other variables. In fact, Tabachnick and Fidell cite the number twenty as an appropriate number of ranks to utilize traditional multivariate statistical procedures. Given these guidelines, the authors felt it was appropriate to utilize factor analysis procedures to analyze their data. Because this study included eighteen values and managers from twelve different nations, the authors felt that it was essential to analyze the data in a way that provided for a parsimonious interpretation of their findings.

The data were analyzed by forced three-, four-, five-, and six-factor solutions. The four-factor solution resulted in the most interpretable and parsimonious factor solution. In addition, the four-factor solution resulted in no value item showing factorial complexity. The four-factor solution was also supported by inspection of the scree plot. Although the four factors only accounted for approximately 41% of the variance, this limited amount of variance explained is consistent with previous research using the Rokeach Values Survey [Rokeach 1973; Howard, Shudo and Umeshima 1983].

Results of the four-factor solution are presented in Table 1. Value items loading 0.40 or greater were regarded as contributing to that dimension. A total of fifteen instrumental values were included in the four value dimensions. The four value dimensions were as follows:

- Value dimension 1 (four items). This dimension included the following instrumental values: cheerful, forgiving, helpful, and loving.
- Value dimension 2 (five items). Instrumental values included in this factor were: clean, obedient, polite, responsible, and self-control.
- Value dimension 3 (three items). This dimension included the following instrumental values: broadminded, capable and courageous.
- Value dimension 4 (three items). Instrumental values included in this dimension were: imaginative, independent and intellectual.

While the above factor analysis procedure resulted in a relatively "clean" factor structure and met our objective of providing a parsimonious interpretation of our data, our analysis does not answer the question of whether or not the factor structure across the twelve nations was similar. Because factor analysis requires relatively large sample sizes, a requirement that none of our national samples met, we proceeded to further analyze our data in the following fashion.

TABLE 1
Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix on Rankings of Eighteen Instrumental Values

| Instrumental Values | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Ambitious | -.35 | .16 | .23 | .26 |
| Broadminded | .16 | -.08 | .61 | .04 |
| Capable | -.30 | .26 | .55 | .06 |
| Cheerful | .59 | .34 | .03 | .02 |
| Clean | .37 | .55 | .05 | .10 |
| Courageous | .29 | -.14 | .46 | .18 |
| Forgiving | .69 | .07 | .23 | -.05 |
| Helpful | .61 | .06 | .19 | -.19 |
| Honest | .34 | .17 | .26 | -.26 |
| Imaginative | -.02 | -.05 | .24 | .59 |
| Independent | .04 | .11 | -.22 | .59 |
| Intellectual | -.08 | .08 | .10 | .54 |
| Logical | -.21 | .37 | .22 | .33 |
| Loving | .71 | .04 | -.29 | .06 |
| Obedient | .25 | .47 | -.34 | .08 |
| Polite | .26 | .68 | -.13 | -.03 |
| Responsible | -.03 | .54 | .25 | -.30 |
| Self-control | -.18 | .63 | -.04 | .10 |
| Variance accounted for | 13.8% | 11.0% | 8.5% | 7.8% |

We organized our entire sample, including managers from countries from which we had fewer than twenty respondents, into three pairings. The three pairings were English-speaking versus non-English-speaking countries, developing versus industrialized countries, and Spanish-speaking versus non-Spanish-speaking countries. Our expanded sample totaled 1,056 managers. Utilizing Lisrel 8.03 we compared the correlation matrices between each of our three pairings. Results indicated that two of our three pairings were significantly different from one another. The correlation matrices between the English-speaking versus non-English-speaking countries was significantly different as were the correlation matrices between the Spanish-speaking versus the non-Spanish-speaking countries. Given the sample sizes in these analyses, significant differences are not particularly surprising.

A more relevant question is whether these differences are practically meaningful to the point that it is inappropriate to aggregate across the countries in conducting the factor analysis. To answer this question we examined the normed fit indexes (NFI) between the three pairings. In each case the normed fit index was high. The NFI between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries was .89, between Spanish-speaking and non-Spanish-speaking countries .86, and between developing and industrialized countries .90. Given these findings, the authors felt it was appropriate to utilize a single, aggregated factor analysis across the twelve nations included in this study.

Prior to examining national differences in the value dimensions, the relative importance of each value dimension for the entire managerial sample was assessed. This was done by averaging the mean rankings of the items that comprised each value dimension. Low numbers indicate a greater importance of a dimension. Value dimension 3, which included the instrumental values broadminded, capable and courageous, was ranked as the most important value dimension by managers, with a mean ranking of 5.55. The second most important value dimension ($M = 7.85$) was value dimension 4, which included the instrumental values imaginative, independent and intellectual. Value dimension 2 was the third most important value dimension ($M = 11.32$). Value dimension 2 included the instrumental values clean, obedient, polite, responsible, and self-control. Finally, value dimension 1 with a mean ranking of 12.33 was ranked the least important of the four value dimensions. Value dimension 1 included the instrumental values cheerful, forgiving, helpful, and loving. For the entire managerial sample, the differences between the mean ranking of each dimension was significantly different from the mean ranking of every other value dimension ($p = .0001$). The same order of rankings was maintained for each nationality in the sample. The averages of the mean rankings of these value dimensions, across countries and by country, are presented in Table 2.

A multivariate analysis of variance procedure treating each of the four instrumental value dimensions as dependent variables, resulted in a significant

TABLE 2
Mean Rankings of Four Instrumental Value Dimensions by Twelve National Samples

| Country | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Australia (n = 36) | 12.65 | 10.94 | 5.63 | 8.32 |
| Brazil (n = 30) | 11.68 | 10.05 | 4.67 | 6.80 |
| Denmark (n = 37) | 11.96 | 11.51 | 5.17 | 8.56 |
| France (n = 32) | 13.05 | 11.32 | 5.63 | 7.82 |
| Great Britain (n = 89) | 12.45 | 11.68 | 6.22 | 7.70 |
| Germany (n = 106) | 12.99 | 10.82 | 5.45 | 7.97 |
| Italy (n = 31) | 12.19 | 11.65 | 5.15 | 6.70 |
| Japan (n = 20) | 10.06 | 9.80 | 6.22 | 7.53 |
| Netherlands (n = 31) | 12.19 | 11.77 | 5.39 | 7.53 |
| Norway (n = 46) | 11.54 | 11.43 | 5.21 | 7.97 |
| Sweden (n = 69) | 12.78 | 12.03 | 4.91 | 8.11 |
| United States (n = 42) | 12.14 | 11.51 | 6.67 | 7.68 |
| Overall Mean Ranking | 12.33 | 11.32 | 5.55 | 7.85 |

Wilks' λ (.847), $F(44,2114) = 2.14$, $p = .0001$, which indicated that there were differences between the responses of managers from different countries. Accordingly, univariate ANOVAs were conducted on each of the value dimensions.

Table 3 presents summary ANOVA statistics testing each of the four instrumental value dimensions across the twelve national samples of managers. A one-way ANOVA procedure showed significant national differences for the first

TABLE 3
Summary Analysis of Variance Results
Four Instrumental Value Dimensions by Twelve National Samples

| Factor 1 (Cheerful, Forgiving, Helpful, and Loving) | | | | |
|---|-----|----------------|---------|---------|
| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | F-Value | p-Value |
| Nationality | 11 | 232.3 | 2.51 | .01 |
| Error | 555 | 4677.4 | | |
| Factor 2 (Clean, Obedient, Polite, Responsible, and Self-Control) | | | | |
| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | F-Value | p-Value |
| Nationality | 11 | 189.8 | 3.12 | .001 |
| Error | 555 | 3069.3 | | |
| Factor 3 (Broadminded, Capable and Courageous) | | | | |
| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | F-Value | p-Value |
| Nationality | 11 | 173.8 | 2.86 | .01 |
| Error | 555 | 3069.3 | | |
| Factor 4 (Imaginative, Independent and Intellectual) | | | | |
| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | F-Value | p-Value |
| Nationality | 11 | 114.9 | 1.26 | ns |
| Error | 555 | 4607.4 | | |

value dimension (cheerful, forgiving, helpful, and loving) [$F(11,555) = 2.51$; $p = .01$]. Additional analysis by means of Duncan multiple range tests showed that Japanese managers assigned a significantly higher priority to the first value dimension than did managers from any other country included in this study.

National differences were also found for the second value dimension (clean, obedient, polite, responsible, and self-control) [$F(11,555) = 3.12$; $p = .001$]. Managers from Brazil and Japan viewed this value dimension as significantly more important than did managers from Sweden, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Italy, the United States, Denmark, Norway, or France. Managers from Australia and Germany viewed this second value dimension with similar importance, as did managers from Brazil and Japan.

The importance assigned the third value dimension, which included the instrumental values broadminded, capable and courageous, was also found to differ significantly by nationality [$F(11,555) = 2.86$; $p = .01$]. Managers from the United States assigned less importance to this value dimension than did managers from Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Italy, Sweden, or Brazil. In addition, Swedish and Brazilian managers viewed this value dimension as significantly more important than did managers from the United States, Japan, or Great Britain.

The importance assigned the fourth and final value dimension, which included the instrumental values imagination, independent and intellectual, was not found to differ significantly across the nations included in this study [$F(11,555) = 1.26$; $p = \text{ns}$].

Although the results of some studies indicate gender differences in respondent values (e.g., Chusmir, Koberg and Mills [1989]; Chusmir and Parker [1991]; de-Vaus and McAllister [1991]), we were unable to control for this potentially confounding variable because there were insufficient females in our sample for statistical purposes. However, we were able to control for the potential effects of age, which many studies have found to be related to values (e.g., Brenner [1988]; Loscocco and Kalleberg [1988]). Age, which was trichotomized into those born after 1943 ($n = 201$), those born between 1936 and 1943 ($n = 215$), and those born before 1936 ($n = 181$), was related only to the second value dimension [$F(2,594) = 3.75$, $p = .02$]. Managers born after 1943 placed less importance on this value dimension, which included the instrumental values clean, obedient, polite, responsible, and self-control, than did either group of older managers. When both age and nationality were included in the model simultaneously, there was no interactive effect between age and nationality on the value dimensions (Wilks' $\lambda = .827$, $F(100,2195) = .937$, ns). Further, the effect of age on the value dimensions was no longer significant (Wilks' $\lambda = .979$, $F(8,106) = 1.47$, ns). However, there continued to be a main effect for nationality on the value dimensions (Wilks' $\lambda = .826$, $F(52,2144) = 2.09$, $p = .001$).

DISCUSSION

Twenty-five years ago, Sirota and Greenwood [1971] observed that successful multinational management hinges on an objective, informed assessment of what employees want from their jobs. Erez (1986), a decade ago, noted that societal values, managerial practices and the congruence between the two sets has a critical influence on organizational outcomes. As discussed previously, a growing body of evidence supports Erez's congruity perspective. Because of these findings, a considerable research effort has been devoted to identifying the values, goals and work attitudes of employees in various nations. The present study, which sought to address the methodological limitations of much of the previous cross-national research, investigated national differences in managerial values. Values were assessed by means of Rokeach's Value Survey instrument.

Factor analysis of the eighteen instrumental values included in Rokeach's Value Survey revealed four underlying value dimensions. Collapsing across the twelve nations in the sample, the value dimension that was ranked as the most important included the broadminded, capable and courageous instrumental values. The second most highly ranked value dimension included the imaginative, independent and intellectual instrumental values. The third highest ranked value dimension included the clean, obedient, polite, responsible, and self-control instrumental values. Finally, the lowest ranked value dimension included cheerful, forgiving, helpful, and loving instrumental values.

Analysis of the data offers support to both those who believe that values are becoming increasingly homogeneous across nations and to those who believe that value differences continue to exist across cultures. For instance, managers from each of the twelve nationalities represented in the sample ranked the four value dimensions in the same order of importance. Additionally, no national differences were found in the importance assigned the fourth value dimension (imaginative, independent and intellectual), which across all nationalities was ranked as the second most important value dimension. Apparently, regardless of nationality, managers view imagination, independence and intellectualism as very important values. Perhaps these findings indicate the extent to which these values, among these nations, have become homogeneous. Several earlier studies support these findings. For example, Elizur, Borg, Hunt, and Beck [1991] found in their study of 2,280 people from eight countries that there was substantial agreement that achievement and performing interesting work were the two most important motivating factors. Similarly, Harpaz [1990] found little difference in the work goals of employees from seven industrialized nations.

On the other hand, other findings show significant value differences across our national samples. Although the first value dimension (cheerful, forgiving, helpful, and loving) was ranked as the least important of the four value

dimensions, Japanese managers ranked this dimension as significantly more important than did any of the other nationalities in this study. This finding is consistent with previous research. Fifteen years ago, it was noted in a Harvard Business School management case study that the Japanese business culture stressed cooperation and a personalized, family-oriented managerial style [Beer, Marsland and Spector 1981]. Eastern cultures were found by Hofstede [1980] to be more collectivistic than Western cultures. Collectivistic cultures may encourage values such as cheerfulness, being forgiving, helpfulness, and love. The finding that Japanese managers rank this dimension as more important also conforms to the Japanese management style. O'Reilly [1988], for example, described Japanese managers as unwilling to publicly confront or debate subordinates or even to give subordinates negative feedback. It seems that this value dimension may be related to work group relations. Cultures that rank this dimension as more important may be better at teamwork than those that rank this dimension as less important.

United States managers viewed the third value dimension (broadminded, capable and courageous) as significantly less important than did managers from seven other nations. Further, managers from Japan and Great Britain viewed this dimension as less important than did managers from Brazil and Sweden. The result pertaining to United States managers is partially consistent with previous research. Whitely and England [1980] found that United States managers attached less importance to two dimensions they labeled personal influence and assertiveness-control. In a study of conflict-handling styles, Ting-Toomey [1988] found that, among a number of nationalities, persons from the United States had the greatest preference for a dominating style, which is inconsistent with being broadminded.

Managers from Brazil and Japan ranked the second value dimension (clean, obedient, polite, responsible, and self-control) as more important than did managers from Denmark, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and the United States. Managers from Australia and Germany rated this value dimension similarly to managers from Brazil and Japan. It is interesting to note that managers from the two non-Western countries in this study placed greater importance on these personal characteristics values than did managers from seven of the ten Western countries.

The continuing existence of national value differences may partially explain the continuing high rates of expatriate failure. In their review of the expatriate acculturation literature, Mendenhall and Oddou [1985] concluded that technical competence and successful performance were the predominant considerations when selecting individuals for overseas assignments. They argued that an assessment of the candidate's perceptual dimension (e.g., the ability to understand why other people behave as they do) is critical for success.

Judging by their actions, it appears that most corporations have adopted the

belief that national values are becoming more homogeneous and therefore managers and management practices are readily transferable. Only 5% of firms were found by Tung [1981] to assess relational ability, a construct similar to perceptual dimension, when evaluating a candidate for an expatriate assignment. Callahan [1989] reported that fewer than 12% of multinational companies provide cross-cultural training for expatriate assignees.

While this study sought to overcome several of the limitations of earlier cross-national studies, this study does possess several limitations. One limitation is the value measure that was utilized. Because of the ipsativity of the measure, we were able to determine the importance of one value dimension relative to another but we were not able to determine the absolute intensity with which certain values were held. As noted by Hambrick and Brandon [1987], the lack of attention to the intensity with which values are held limits theoretical and empirical advancement. Conceivably, the national differences found on the three value dimensions may have been even more pronounced, and those differences were suppressed due to the rank order measure employed.

A second limitation is that we assumed that the factor structure for the overall sample from the twelve countries is the same for each of the countries. Although we attempted to examine whether the factor structure fit the data for various subgroups, we were unable to examine this question at the country level due to the small sample size for each country. Based on the results of our analysis of various subgroups, we do believe, however, that this problem, while non-trivial, does not invalidate our analysis.

Finally, a third possible limitation of the present study needs to be acknowledged. Managers who attend IMD-sponsored management development programs are, in all probability, not wholly representative of managers within the nations they represent. For example, IMD participants hold exclusively middle- and upper-level management positions, they are fluent in English, and many have held management positions outside their countries of citizenship. Even though this may be a limitation of the present study, this study provides insight into the value systems of prominent managers from a number of different nations and companies.

REFERENCES

- Adler, Nancy J. & Mariann Jelinek. 1986. Is "organization culture" culture bound? *Human Resource Management*, 25: 73-90.
- Bass, Bernard M. & Larry D. Eldridge. 1973. Accelerated managers' objectives in twelve countries. *Industrial Relations*, 12: 158-71.
- Beer, Michael, Stephen Marsland & Bert Spector. 1981. Note on Japanese management and employment systems. Harvard Business School case study, 9-481-009.
- Black, J. Stewart & Lyman W. Porter. 1991. Managerial behaviors and job performance: A successful manager in Los Angeles may not succeed in Hong Kong. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 22(1): 99-113.

- Brenner, O.C. 1988. Relations of age and education to managers' work values. *Psychological Reports*, 63: 639-42.
- Callahan, Madelyn R. 1989. Preparing the new global manager. *Training and Development Journal*, March: 28-32.
- Chusmir, Leonard H., Christine S. Koberg & Joan Mills. 1989. Male-female differences in the association of managerial style and personal values. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 129: 65-78.
- Chusmir, Leonard H. & Barbara Parker. 1991. Gender and situational differences in managers' values: A look at work and home lives. *Journal of Business Research*, 23: 325-35.
- Cox, Charles J. & Cary L. Cooper. 1985. The irrelevance of American organizational sciences to the UK and Europe. *Journal of General Management*, 11(2): 27-34.
- de Vaus, David & Ian McAllister. 1991. Gender and work orientation: Values and satisfaction in Western Europe. *Work and Occupations*, 18: 72-93.
- Dowling, Peter J. & Trevor W. Nagel. 1986. Nationality and work attitudes: A study of Australian and American business majors. *Journal of Management*, 12: 121-28.
- Earley, P. Christopher. 1989. Social loafing and collectivism. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 34: 556-81.
- Elizur, Dov, Ingwer Borg, Raymond Hunt & Istvan Magyari Beck. 1991. The structure of work values: A cross cultural comparison. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12: 21-38.
- Erez, Miriam. 1986. The congruence of goal setting strategies with socio-cultural values and its effect on performance. *Journal of Management*, 12: 585-92.
- Hambrick, Donald C. & George L. Brandon. 1987. Executive values. In D.C. Hambrick, editor, *The executive effect: Concepts and methods for studying top managers*. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Harpaz, Itzhak. 1990. The importance of work goals: An international perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21(1): 75-93.
- Heiskanen, Tuula A. 1985. How car and steel workers in different countries see their work. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 6: 273-92.
- Hofstede, Geert. 1980. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- . 1993. Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1): 81-94.
- & Michael H. Bond. 1988. The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(Summer): 5-21.
- Howard, Ann, Keitaro Shudo & Miyo Umeshima. 1983. Motivation and values among Japanese and American managers. *Personnel Psychology*, 36: 883-98.
- Jaeger, Alfred M. 1986. Organizational development and national culture: Where's the fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 178-90.
- Kanungo, Rabindra Nath & Richard W. Wright. 1983. A cross-cultural comparative study of managerial job attitudes. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14(2): 115-29.
- Kedia, Ben L. & Rabi S. Bhagat. 1988. Cultural constraints on the transfer of technology across nations: Implications for research in international and comparative management. *Academy of Management Review*, 13: 559-71.
- Laurent, Andre. 1983. The cultural diversity of Western management conceptions. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 8(1-2): 75-96.

- Lee, K.C. 1991. The problem of appropriateness of the Rokeach value survey in Korea. *International Journal of Psychology*, 26: 299-310.
- Likert, Rensis. 1967. *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Loscocco, Karyn A. & Arne L. Kalleberg. 1988. Age and the meaning of work in the United States and Japan. *Social Forces*, 67: 337-56.
- Mendenhall, Mark & Gary R. Oddou. 1985. The dimensions of expatriate acculturation: A review. *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 39-47.
- Miethe, Terance D. 1985. The validity and reliability of value measurements. *Journal of Psychology*, 119: 441-53.
- Morris, Tom & Cynthia M. Pavett. 1992. Management style and productivity in two cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(1): 169-79.
- O'Reilly, Brian. 1988. Japan's uneasy U.S. managers. *Fortune*, April 25: 245.
- Ralston, David A., David J. Gustafson, Priscilla M. Elsass, Fanny Cheung & Robert H. Terpstra. 1992. Eastern values: A comparison of managers in the United States, Hong Kong, and the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77: 664-71.
- Ravlin, Elizabeth C. & Bruce M. Meglino. 1987. Issues in work values measurement. In W.C. Frederick & L.E. Preston, editors, *Research in corporate social performance and policy*, Vol. 9, 153-83. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Rokeach, Milton. 1968. *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- . 1973. *The nature of human values*. New York: The Free Press.
- Shenkar, Oded & Simcha Ronen. 1987. The cultural context of negotiation: The implications of Chinese interpersonal norms. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 23: 263-75.
- Sirota, David & Michael Greenwood. 1971. Understanding your overseas workforce. *Harvard Business Review*, 51(1): 53-60.
- Schwind, Herman F. & Richard B. Peterson. 1985. Shifting values in the Japanese management system. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 15(2): 60-74.
- Tabachnick, Barbara G. & Linda S. Fidell. 1989 (second edition). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ting-Toomey, Stella. 1988. Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y.Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst, editors, *Theories in intercultural communication*, 213-35. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Tung, Rosalie L. 1981. Selection and training of personnel for overseas assignments. *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 16: 68-78.
- & Edwin L. Miller. 1990. Managing in the twenty-first century: The need for global orientation. *Management International Review*, 30: 5-18.
- Welsh, Dianne, Fred Luthans & Steven M. Sommer. 1993. Managing Russian factory workers: The impact of U.S.-based behavioral and participative techniques. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 58-79.
- Whitely, William & George W. England. 1980. Variability in common dimensions of managerial values due to value orientation and country differences. *Personnel Psychology*, 33: 77-8.
- Yasin, Mahmoud M., Thomas W. Zimmerer & Ronald F. Green. 1989. Cultural values as determinants of executive attitudes. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, 2(2): 35-47.