كلية دبي للإدارة الحكومية
DUBAI SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

The Impact of Culture on Management and Development: A Comparative Review

Khalid Al-Yahya
Dubai School of Government

Michael Lubatkin
University of Connecticut

Richard Vengroff
University of Connecticut

January 2009

Working Paper Series

No. 09-01

The Impact of Culture on Management and Development: A Comparative Review

Khalid Al-Yahya, Michael Lubatkin, and Richard Vengroff

January 2009

Correspondence
Khalid Al-Yahya: Dubai School of Government; Khalid.alyahya@dsg.ae

This working paper is a chapter in the forthcoming *Handbook of Bureaucracy*, ed. Ali Farazmand. New York: Marcel Dekker, 2009.

Introduction

The replicability of Western management and development models in non-Western settings has been the subject of diverse interpretations by scholars in the fields of both development and development administration. For years, many leading analysts have studied the applicability of Western management models to the conditions of developing nations such as those of Africa (Hickson, 1974; Leonard, 1977; Hyden, 1983; Hage and Finsterbush, 1985; Montgomery, 1985; Vengroff, 1988, 1990; Lubatkin, Ndiaye, & Vengroff, 1997). Recent research has continued to explore and emphasize the relationship between a variety of management practices and different dimensions of cultures including those of Europe (Hofstede, 1980; Trauth, 2000; Brewster, 1994; Kakabadse, 1993; Brodbeck et al, 1995; Myers et al, 1995; Newman and Nollen, 1996; Very et al, 1997; Veiga et al, 2000), Asia (Hofestede and Bond, 1984; Misumi, 1984; Ralston et al, 1997; Probst et al., 2000; Salk & Brannen, 2000; Heuer, et al, 1999), Latin America (Ralston et al, 1997; Grimaldi, 1986; Carlos, Pereira and Spink, 1999; Osland, Snyder and Hunter, 1998; Abramo, 1998; Hofstede, 1980; Diaz-Gurrero, 1994), and the Middle East (Hill et al, 1998; Tayed, 1988; Ali, Taqi and Krishnan, 1997; Ali, 1992; Bakhtari, 1995).

The classic thinking of management and public administration has always centered on the principles of management that were viewed to be applicable in every organization regardless of its cultural settings. Cultural factors did not make any difference in administrative settings because, after all, administration is administration and principles are principles.

However, the role national culture plays in management practices and economic development has become a major subject in the past few decades especially for global organizations, students of “new public management”, and international development professionals who have gradually recognized the importance of matching the internal characteristics of organization (strategy, structure, systems, and practices) to the key external characteristics (national culture, history, and political institutions). The cultural values and historical experiences play a major role in the development and functioning of administrative systems including institutional arrangements and organizational structures and the shaping of work values and preferences.

I. The Universality of Managerial Work Values

The work of Mintzberg (1973) is indeed central to what is known today in the comparative management as “the universality hypothesis.” This hypothesis suggests that Western management theories, particularly organization theories, are applicable worldwide regardless of culture or historic experience of a society (Mintzberg, 1973; Hickson, 1974; Leonard, 1977; Drentch, 1985; Hage and Finsterbush, 1985; Montgomery, 1985a,b,c; Vengroff, 1988; Yukl, 1994; Lubatkin, Ndiaye, and Vengroff,1997; Salk and Brannen, 2000). Implicit in the universality perspective is the idea that at some basic level, people in organizations think and act similarly (aiming toward best practices), and that these similarities can be the basis for a generic theory of organization development (Bjur and Zomorrodian, 1986).

Mintzberg (1973) argues that manager's jobs are remarkably similar from one setting to another and that the work of all managers can be usefully described by common sets of behavior and roles. The traditional concept of managerial work which has dominated the academic vocabulary since the time of the French industrialist Henri Fayol (1916) tells us little about what managers actually do (Mintzberg, 1971a; 1971b; 1973). Using the "structured observation" method, Mintzberg closely monitored the activities of chief executives of five medium to large private sector organizations. He also examined some of the available studies on how managers in the United States, Canada, Sweden, and Great Britain spend their time. A synthesis of these studies along with the findings from his own research enabled him to define all managerial work as consisting of three main categories of roles: interpersonal roles, informational roles, and decisional roles.

The relevance of Mintzberg's managers' role model, however, has been the subject of a great deal of discussion among academicians in the field of development management and organization theory. Lau, Newman, and Broedling (1980), conducted an extensive study on the nature of managerial work in the public sector in the United States. They drew a sample of executives in the federal government (N = 370) who were to describe their job content using Mintzberg's framework and description of managerial roles. The basic finding was that the responses yielded by these executives confirmed Mintzberg's universality hypothesis. Alexander (1979), similarly, undertook an empirical study employing survey research on a sample of 225 managers in the United States. The overall goal was to examine the effect of both manager's level in the hierarchy and functional area on the extent to which Mintzberg's managerial roles are required by managerial jobs. Here also, the data suggest that the managerial functional area has a strong significant effect on the extent to which Mintzberg's roles are applicable.

Hickson (1974), Leonard (1977), and Hage and Finsterbush (1987) argue that culture plays a minor role in the applicability of Western organization theories to the conditions of non-Western countries, especially Third World countries. In fact, they assert that irrespective of culture, bureaucratic organizations operate the same way regardless of where they are located. Their research, by noting that many organizational relationships are stable across societies, is consistent with the universalist hypothesis.

There is among the universalists a subgroup of convergence theorists who, while accepting the proposition that culture has an important but limited impact on management, suggest that the impact varies inversely with the level of economic development. Hyden (1983), for instance, states that cultural differences in management, although of some importance today in Africa, will disappear progressively as countries develop. In other words, with increasing industrialization the influence of economic and technological factors will become stronger than the impact of culture. This argument, known as the "convergence hypothesis," is strongly supported by authors like Clausen (1968) and Lauter (1969).

These views were partially supported by a recent network study that examined the role of national culture in determining individual influence in a multinational team (Salk and Brannen, 2000). The network study was conducted on a management team of a 50-50 German-Japanese international joint venture (IJV).

Japanese and German managers were viewed to have different preferences and work values. However, the findings indicated no systematic differences between national subgroups on multinational teams on the vast majority of indicators, and no significance for nationality as an explanatory variable for influence. There were no differences in centrality measures, influence ratings, formal position, and tenure for national subgroups.

Although there were no significant differences between national subgroups, national culture remains important in explaining relationships and work attitudes in the work place. It was noted though that Japanese and Germans differ in their attitudes towards private (personal) network relationships. The analysis of private network revealed that Germans had a low number of private relationships. On the other hand, Japanese managers had a significantly higher number of multilayered personal and professional interactions. Moreover, for the advice network, the analysis showed Japanese managers to have very heavy reliance for advice on the in-group (high average in-group density and low out-group density). Furthermore, Japanese managers scored higher than their German counterparts on the degree to which individuals need to adapt their way of working to local norms to be effective in the IJV. However, this attitude may be attributed to the fact that the Japanese managers were expatriates and the Germans were operating in their own country (198). The authors suggested that although national origins or identities affect team members' preferences and work behavior, certain aspects of national culture tend to disappear over time (Salk and Brannen, 2000; Salk, 1996), as suggested by the convergence theorists. It should be noted here that team members as well as expatriates do not necessarily reflect the general population tendencies. They tend to be more homogenous in terms of education, occupation, organizational orientations, and socioeconomic status, that is to say they are more homogenous than their respective national populations.

In an attempt to relate national culture and economic ideology to convergence-divergence question, Ralston, Holt, Terptra, and Kai-Cheng (1997) proposed a crossvergence approach as an "integrative alternative" for and a continuum between the two polar extremes convergence and divergence. They pointed out that proponents of the convergence perspective argue that economic ideology drives values, implying that as countries become industrialized, there is a significant value change towards individualistic-capitalistic values. Developing countries, largely socialistic-collectivist oriented, "would subsequently be expected to assimilate ideologically driven values common to industrialized, capitalistic Western countries (Ralston et al., 1997: 4). Conversely, the divergence perspective argues that culture, not economic ideology, determines work values.

Thus, work values in socialist Eastern nations would not change toward those embraced by Western individualistic-capitalistic nations, regardless of the process and degree of industrialization. Ralston et al (1997), for example, conducted a study based on a sample of 855 managers from four countries: the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. Researchers used the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) as their measure because it provides a three-fold higher-order dimensional continua-individualism, openness-to-change and self-enhancement and a set of ten sub dimensions—power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. The analysis of this higher-order dimensional continuum indicates that the American managers scored higher than the Russians, the Russians scored higher than the Japanese, and the Japanese scored higher than the Chinese (11). However, the finding for self-enhancement-self-transcendence is more consistent with the national culture-based divergence perspective. Both the American and Russian managers scored significantly higher than the Japanese and Chinese managers, indicating the influence of national culture on the self-enhancement measure.

The researchers found that "one's self-orientation values appear to be more influenced by culture" and that the rate of value change and adoption of Western capitalist ideology varies from one group to another. For instance, Russians appeared more likely than Chinese to adopt the U.S. capitalistic values. However, this does not suggest that China will not develop some form of capitalism, but more likely it will develop " a form of that is uniquely compatible with the Chinese culture" (Ralston, et al: 12). Overall, the study's findings do not offer strong support for the divergence or the convergence perspectives. In other words, findings neither support the ideal of a seamless nor borderless corporate culture. The analysts suggest that "the global corporate culture concept may be viable in the long term, especially if crossvergence proves to be a transitional state, and values assimilation is a mutual process…This implies that focusing effort on understanding and coordinating the different cultural values would be a strategy more than trying to force-fit them into a single corporate culture" (14).

Extensive research on the issue of management training needs and the replicability of Western models in the African context was completed by Montgomery in 1984 and Vengroff et al. in 1988. The nine countries of the Southern African Development Co-Ordination Conference (SADCC), Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, recognizing the key role that management plays in their prospects for sustained development and growth, cooperated in a large-scale study to assess management problems and training needs in their region. The SADCC study team, led by John Montgomery, covered not only the public and private sector but also various intermediate hybrids, parastatals, and public enterprises or statutory enterprises (Montgomery, 1985a; 1985b; 1985c; 1986a; 1986b; 1986c). Respondent were asked to report on and rate their daily activities (management events) in terms of importance and time.

Building on the SADCC study, Vengroff (1988) undertook an extensive study under the auspices of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to assess the extent of management training needs in the Central African Republic (CAR) (Vengroff, 1988, 1990; Vengroff, Belhaj, and Ndiaye, 1991). A series of structured interviews with a sample of public sector managers was conducted. The questionnaire basically replicated the same management events generated by the SADCC research. Overall, the findings in both the SADCC and the CAR studies are consistent with Mintzberg's model, although some nuances directly related to the African milieu were identified.

Lubatkin, Ndiaye, and Vengroff (1997) conducted a study to further examine the universality hypothesis, and tested it against two competing hypotheses—situational and convergence. The situational hypothesis suggests that there are many models of management, not only across nations and levels of industrialization, but also within nations. For example, the activities of managers within nations differ at different levels of the managerial hierarchy (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1987), and will depend on whether the organization is part of the private or public sector (Perry and Rainy, 1988). Lubatkin, Ndiaye, and Vengroff constructed a stratified sample of managers from two non-Anglo Saxon developing countries, Senegal and Hungary, to assess the effects of hierarchy and sector on managerial activities and then compared their findings about managers in these two countries with Vengroff's findings for managers in the CAR. The results are consistent with the universalist hypothesis. The findings do not support the situational hypothesis that suggests that management activities differ not only across nations but also within nations at different levels of managerial hierarchy, and depend on the sector to which an organization belongs. The study suggests that neither sector, hierarchal level, nor the interaction of sector and hierarchy represent significant situational influences among Senegalese and Hungarian managers. These results, along with Vengroff's findings for CAR managers (Vengroff, 1990), are consistent with the argument that the nature of managerial work is generally similar across and within nations. Furthermore, the findings are not consistent with the convergence hypothesis. The analysis revealed no significant differences with any of the skill activities in the three nations. Although their findings strongly support the universalist hypothesis, the authors point out that they cannot conclude from their data that managerial work is perfectly universal. However, there does appear to be a general tendency towards universalism.

In one cross-European study, Lubatkin, Calori, Very and Veiga (1998) surveyed top managers of French and British firms that were recently acquired by French or British firms as to their perceptions of the acquiring firm's managerial headquarter-subsidiary controlling mechanisms. In all they received at least one useable response from 35 French and 48 British acquired firms, representing four different sample groupings: 22 French managers who were involved in a total of 19 mergers where acquiring firm was also French; 25 French managers representing 16 mergers with British acquiring firms; 26 British managers representing 23 mergers with British acquiring firms; and British managers representing 25 mergers with French acquiring firms. Using a between-nation multiple analysis of covariance design, they found administrative differences between the British and French that were consistent with what is known the backgrounds of the two nations. In a companion paper, Calori, Lubatkin, Very and Veiga (1997) used historical data and historical institutional analysis to model those differences. They speculated that they might have found even greater differences had they based their analysis on samples drawn from nations with clearer ethnocentric contrasts, e.g., a first-world country with a third-world country, or a western country with an oriental country.

II. The Culture-Specific Theory of Development Management

The universalist and convergence hypotheses have been highly debated, particularly in the past two decades, in comparative cross-cultural management literature. Most of the literature on managerial behaviors across cultures is too general and tends to be studied in functional terms (planning, leading, controlling, and so on); telling us little about which "management behaviors are relevant in what cultural settings" (Michael, 1997). This reality resulted in an explosive growth of cross-cultural managerial studies addressing a variety of "casual" relationship between culture and different aspects of management. Adler and Bartholomew (1992) surveyed major academic and professional journals and found that 70 percent of all international organization behavior and human resources management articles have discussed the concept of culture (Alder and Bartholomew, 1992). They indicated that almost all articles concluded that culture had an impact on management related issues being studied such as organizational behavior and HRM. Although convergence theorists maintained that managerial roles and work values worldwide was becoming more similar (Cole 1973; Hickson, 1974; Lubatkin, Ndiaye, and Vengroff, 1997; Kerr et al. 1952; Negandhi 1979, 1985), a review of the recent literature appears to be supportive of divergence and the congruence hypothesis that emphasizes the need for matching management practice with culture (Hofstede, 1984; Adler and Bartholomew, 1992; Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1993; Tayeb, 1994; Kakabadse, 1993; Myers et al., 1995; Newman and Nollen, 1996; Hill et al, 1998; Pelled and Xin, 1997; Brodbeck et al., 2000; Robert et al, 2000). As Hofstede states (1984: 81):

> …the notion of a "Western" culture which justified universal "Western" modern management methods is also crumbling. It has become more and more clear that managing in different Westerns countries like Germany, France, Sweden, U.K. is not the same activity and that many usual generalizations are, in fact, no justified… There is a need among international managers and management theorists for a much deeper understanding of the range of culture-determined values systems that, in fact, exists among countries, and should be taken into account when transferring management ideas from one country to another.

Empirical evidence supports Hofstede's view that there is no uniform management style even among the most advanced societies. For example, a cross-cultural study in Europe that was based on 2,500 respondents revealed not one but four types of culture at the top management level: 'Consensus' (common among Swedish and Finnish top managers); 'towards a common goal' (German and Austrian); 'managing from a distance' (French); and 'leading from the front' (British, Spanish and Irish) (Kakabadse, 1993; Myers, Kakabadse, McMahon, Spony, 1995). Each of these cultures or styles was found to have significant implications for the people in the organization and the business itself. For example, level of consensus was found to influence the degree of job satisfaction, internal relationships, organizational performance, and the process of change management. Brewster (1994) also suggested that U.S. human resource policies and practices are unpopular in European countries, due partly to cultural differences between the United States and Europe. Overall, these studies indicated that national differences at the senior managerial levels were apparent, sometimes even within the same organization operating in different cultures or nations. The members of the European board of GM, a US multinational, have exhibited considerably different management styles, a factor that seriously influenced patterns of communication and interaction, the quality of dialogue, and management focus (Myers, Kakabadse, McMahon & Spony, 1995).

Although these authors concluded "a common European management style is unlikely to become reality in the short term," they suggested, "experience in working in a cross-national team could, over a period of time, create a homogeneous team style" (Myers et al, 1995:17). Despite such claims that Europeanisation may well be under way (facilitated by the removal of technical and regulatory barriers), the authors see no convergence tendencies between “the” European management style and those of other advanced countries. Building on Hofstede's and Trompenaars' research, and based on their studies at the Cranfield School of Management in the UK, it was concluded that “whereas the tried and tested US model of management concentrates on finance and marketing and the Japanese one on quality and just-in-time production, Europe's version emphasizes softer people skills. These include the ability to form a common vision in culturally diverse organizations and help to promote collaboration across borders” (Myers et al, 1995:19).

Culture Theories and Methodologies

Hofstede (1980) states that theories—including Western management theories—indeed reflect the cultural environment in which they are developed. If this is true, according to Hofstede, Italian, British, German, French, and American Theories reflect the culture of Italy, Britain, Germany, France, and the United States of their day. The question is then, To what extent do theories developed in one country and reflecting the cultural boundaries of that country apply to other countries? More specifically, do American management theories apply to other countries? Hence, Hofstede suggests that culture be explicitly addressed when one’s research deals with the replicability of theories from one setting to another setting.

Over a period of six years (1967-1973), Hofstede undertook an extensive study based on a value survey module (VSM) among employees, including managers, at all levels of a U.S. multinational corporation operating in forty countries to determine empirically the main criteria by which their national cultures differed. He found four such criteria, which he labels dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism-collectivism, and masculinity-femininity (Hofstede, 1980, pp.45-46). These dimensions provide guidance for understanding differences in the "collective mental programming of people" (Hofstede 1980) and for determining organizational structure and managerial practices across countries (Murphy, 1999).

Using these four dimensions, Hofstede was able to assign an index value to each country on each dimension. Overall, this finding suggests that, given their various cultural differences, countries in the sample can be grouped in clusters. Hofstede’s analysis supports a contingency theory that devises culture cluster categories, Latin, Anglo-Saxon, and so on, that are characterized in terms of organization (centralization versus decentralization, bureaucratic control, power distribution, etc.). In a later study focused on Asian managers, an additional cultural dimension, “Confucian dynamism,” was added to the list (Hofstede and Bond, 1984) and one of the other dimensions was dropped.

Hofstede’s theoretical perspective on the impact of cultural differences on management is reinforced by other scholars who argue for the existence of broad clusters of cultures among nations. Laurent (1985), for instance, hypothesized that “the national origin of European managers significantly affects their views of what proper management should be.” On the basis of data gathered from 817 respondents from ten different Western countries (nine European and the United States) attending the various executive development programs between 1977 and 1979 at INSEAD in France, he developed an ecological factor analysis technique to evaluate the impact of national cultures on the respondent’s managerial ideologies.

The findings suggest that, overall national culture strongly affects popular conceptions of management.

These theoretical perspectives were also supported by a comprehensive study with a sample of 6,052 middle managers from 22 European countries (Brodbeck et al, 2000). The study examined empirically the relationship between culture and leadership concepts in Europe and highlights the interrelationship between "societal cultural diversity and the diversity in management style" in general. The authors were able to group the countries in the sample in two major clusters within which other subclusters were identified. The first cluster was labeled "North/West region", and included the Anglo, Nordic and Germanic countries and the Czech Republic. The second cluster, "South/East region," included visible subclusters of the Latin European countries (Italy, Spain, Portugal) and Hungary, and countries from Central Europe (Poland, Slovenia), the Near East (Turkey, Greece) and Russia and Georgia. This clustering is consistent with the Ronen and Shenkar's cultural clustering for European countries (Ronen and Shenkar, 1985).

Using Multidimensional Scaling (MDS), Brodbeck et al (2000) identified three across-region dimensions: "Interpersonal Directness and Proximity", "Autonomy", and "Modesty." The `Interpersonal Directness and Proximity' dimension appeared to separate the South/East from the North/West European countries (the only exceptions were former East Germany and Portugal). The identified leadership dimensions were also correlated with the two cultural dimensions for Europe subsequently reported in by Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996), which were labeled "Egalitarian Commitment" and "Loyal Involvement". "Egalitarian Commitment" correlated with the "Interpersonal Directness and Proximity" dimension and "Loyal Involvement" with "Modesty." Thirdly, with regards to whether the identified dimensions reflect macro-level differences which distinguish between major cultural regions (e.g. North/West vs. South/East), rather than micro-level differences within cultural regions, the study concluded that "the within-region dimensions found to distinguish between countries and cultural subclusters within the North/West European region are somewhat different in content than the across-region dimensions found for Europe overall."

Overall, the clusters of European countries (Anglo, Nordic, Germanic, Latin and Near East European countries), which, differ in cultural values were found to differ in leadership prototypes. Furthermore, the probability that leadership concepts are compatible or similar is higher in countries within the same cultural clusters and regions than between countries that belong to different cultural clusters and regions. It also suggested overlap exists between the across-region dimensions and the within-region dimensions for North/West and South/East European countries. Overall, the results strongly support the hypothesis that leadership concepts vary by culture and that "leadership prototypes correspond significantly with the more general cultural values held by managers and employees in contemporary Europe." Furthermore, the probability that leadership concepts are compatible or similar is higher in countries within the same cultural clusters and regions than countries that belong to different cultural clusters and regions (Brodbeck et al, 2000).

Veiga, Lubatkin, Tung, Calori and Very (2001) showed the promise of using an artificial intelligence technique known as neural network analysis as an aid to uncovering the underlying patterns, or trace effects, of national culture. In brief, a neural network is modeled on the human brain in which there are extensively interconnected units (neurons) that make up a vast network capable of complex pattern recognition. As such, it is composed of many computational elements operating in parallel and arranged in patterns reminiscent of biological neural nets. The purpose of such emulation is to produce artificial systems capable of sophisticated, perhaps intelligent, computation and pattern recognition similar to those that the human brain routinely performs.

Viega et al (2000) used the neural network analysis to explore each of the twenty-three survey items collected by Very, Lubatkin, Calori and Veiga (1997) to assess the association between post merger performance and perceptions of cultural compatibility in recent French and British mergers. Using each item (input neurons), separately and in combination, this artificial intelligence technique found the optimal (most accurate) network pattern needed to predict post-merger performance (output neuron) in each country.

As they noted, no other statistical technique is as capable of providing the kinds of pattern recognition that neural network analysis can. For example, factor analysis or cluster analysis have some pattern recognition capabilities, yet neither of these tools is capable of discovering data relationships between variables. Applying other explanatory tools, such as regression, would have required that we treat each of the twenty-three items as independent variables. However, since the twenty-three items are from one measure and are, of necessity, correlated, they would have violated the restrictions on correlation matrices (multicollinearity). This concern, in effect, eliminates the use of regression techniques as well as other ANOVA-associated models such as discriminant analysis. In short, they recommend that cross-cultural researchers should consider this tool part of their ever-expanding kit.

Congruence between Management Practices and National Culture: Implications on Organizational Performance

The concept of management practice-culture fit, commonly referred to as the “congruence hypothesis” has produced an important strategy, particularly for multinational corporations, seeking to improve organizational performance. Recent studies support such linkage between cultural variables and organizational performance. Using Hofstede’s five national culture dimensions, Newman and Nollen (1996) conducted a comprehensive cross-national study that highlighted the importance of congruence between management practices and national culture and its impact on organizational performance. They found that culture has considerable impact on organizational performance. The study, which was based on data drawn from employees of a company operating in eighteen countries, supports the congruence hypothesis that management practices should be matched to national culture and that “the differences in cultures limit the transferability of management practices from one to the other…the more different the host country culture is from the company’s home country culture, the more the company will need to adapt. If we take national culture to be relatively immutable, the onus is on managers to adapt.” Newman and Nollen suggest that companies should “take national culture as a given and adjust their practices accordingly. This also means that American firms, for example, should not try to become more like Japanese firms or German firms" (Newman and Nollen, 1996: 774).

Organization performance is better when management practices are well-adapted and consistent with the local culture. Similar management practices are shown to have different outcomes because of cultural differences. Management activities that emphasize individual contributions such as employee participation and merit-based pay are likely to improve employee performance and profitability in individualistic countries with a culture of low power distance and high masculinity such as the US, but these management practices are likely to worsen, not improve, those desirable outcomes in countries with different cultures such as those in Latin Europe and East Asia (Newman and Nollen, 1996). It was concluded that "work units that are managed consistent with the values of the external culture are more profitable than work units in which the fit is less well achieved" (Newman and Nollen, 1996: 774). Overall, the congruence hypothesis was supported for the dimensions of national culture except for one: uncertainly avoidance. The congruence between uncertainty avoidance and the clarity of management direction and policies was only partially supported.

Other studies reported similar findings with regards to the relationship between culture and human resources management (Kluckholn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Jackson and Schuler, 1995; Pelled and Xin, 1997), on empowerment and continuous improvement (Probst et al., 2000), and on the organizational change process (Breu, 2001). Schuler and Rogovsky (1998), for example, examined quantitatively the relationships between the cultural dimensions of a society and specific human resources compensation practices of firms across twenty-four countries. Their study suggests that national culture is a major explanation for the variance in the utilization of different compensation practices in different countries. They concluded that MNCs should find a fit between compensation and national culture. For example, companies operating in individualistic societies with lower levels of uncertainty avoidance and power distance should use individual incentive compensation practices such as pay-for-performance, share options and stock-ownership plans. Seniority-based or skill-based compensation practices are more congruent in countries with high levels of uncertainty avoidance (Schuler and Rogovsky, 1998). Social benefits and social programs that pay attention to personal and social needs are preferable in societies with high femininity values such as emphasis on quality of life and caring for other people (Kluckholn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Jackson and Schuler, 1995).

Probst et al. (2000) also found that cultural environment affects employee's attitudes towards particular management practices such as empowerment and continuous improvement. In their study that included a sample of employees from the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India, the authors found that in high-power-distance cultures like India, employees had unfavorable views of their managers when empowerment was high. In the U.S., Mexico, and Poland, viewed as low-power-distance cultures, employees rated their managers high when empowerment was high. On the other hand, the findings showed that continuous improvement is positively associated with satisfaction with co-workers as well as with the work itself in all four countries. This finding suggests that some management practices like continuous improvement may not be as sensitive to cultural differences.

Crozier and Friedberg (1980), Riggs (1973), and Bourgoin (1984) posit a management function that is directly responsive to culture. Heady (1984), in particular, contends that Western management styles are not applicable to developing nations, for these models are based on the Weberian ideal model of bureaucracy, which, in large part, is neither stressed nor internalized by managers in developing countries. Bjur and Zomorrodian (1986) suggest that given existing environmental—including cultural—traits and differences, there is a need for a context-based framework for administrative theories, "for one should not assume that there is any trans-cultural consensus about societal values." The contingency perspective on the impact of cultural differences on management is also supported by Neghandi's argument that, indeed, (a) "there is no one-way of doing things"; (b) "there is no universal applicability of either authoritarian or participating-democratic management styles'; and (c) "there are enough similarities and differences among the managers around the world" (Neghandi, 1985, p. 75).

Some authors (Kiggundu, 1989; Nzelibe, 1986) contend that the underlying principles of management in Africa are quite different from those which apply in the West. For example, the central elements of modern African management, they argue, revolve around traditionalism, communalism, and cooperative teamwork. The inclusion of such elements from African management thinking in day to day operations indeed constitutes a serious problem in indigenous management capacities. Ahiauzu (1986) suggest that recent studies are beginning to show that attitudes and behavior of African industrial workers are different in many aspects from those of their counterparts in the West. Lubatkin et al (1999) note that while there are many similarities between African and Western views of management roles, there are major differences in perspectives on power sharing, particularly delegation, decentralization and a strict adherence to administrative texts (Lubatkin et al, 1999). The influences that shape the Africans' actions and thought system in the workplace are likely to emanate from a historical, cultural base. In a 1988 study of culture and management in Eastern Africa, Warwick (1988) also contends that to be successful program designs and organization must integrate indigenous collective attitudes and local pressures. In an observation similar to Warwick's, Deny (1990) contends that the socioeconomic and cultural environments of development programs have a decisive impact on premises about desirable cultural change, without sufficient attention either to the prospects that such changes will occur, or to how this might be achieved. Projects, he concludes, must then involve some compromise among accommodations, rather than trying to change prevailing cultural traits.

In the cross-cultural management and decision behavior literature, the Arab world as a region is either classified as a single distinct cluster (Arab or Islamic) or included in oriental clusters or groupings of traditional countries (Al-Yahya, 2004). Although countries in the Arab world (a region that spans from the Atlantic edge of Africa through the northern part of the continent to the Persian Gulf, and from Sudan to the Middle East (Dedoussis, 2004)) vary in their cultural orientations, institutional and administrative arrangements, economic development, and historical experiences with colonization and globalism, the "culture" of Arab countries is often characterized as sharing relatively high collectivist and power-distance orientations, as well as highly centralized hierarchal decision making. For example, because participative decision making implies sharing of authority and taking greater responsibility, it is expected that participation would be influenced by cultural values (e.g., power distance and collectivism) that an individual or a culture holds.[1]

However, recent research on the Middle East by Al-Yahya (2005) demonstrates that some modern forms of participative management are not an alien concept to most Arab and Asian organizations. He points out tendencies among researchers to oversimplify the complexity of culture and, in many cases, strongly uphold its fixity and coherence. Compared to findings of earlier studies conducted 20-25 years ago (Muna, 1980; Badawy, 1980), his findings may signal a new pattern in managerial values and attitudes embedded in a process of hybridization of formal and informal, modern and traditional of management forms. This process can be influenced by the context (local, national, or transnational) within which the concerned organization operates. Additional longitudinal studies are needed to confirm the theoretical claims of an emerging trend leading to a more hybridization of, not necessarily full convergence, international of managerial values (Al-Yahya, 2005).

It is our feeling that the differing views expressed in the literature on cultural contingencies and their impact on institutional norms (behavior and performance) are far from being resolved. Yet, the culture factor, in any case, has yet to be fully captured and its influence on management performance evaluated thoroughly. In spite of evidence of “cultural consequences” suggested in many recent development studies, there is yet no conclusive set of research findings “to show the relative importance of cultural variables (e.g., values, social relations) and non-cultural variables (e.g., technology, structure) in explaining management process and organizational performance at both the operating and the strategic management levels” (Kiggundu, 1989, p. 29). If culture plays a minor role in determining the relevance of Western organization theories to the conditions of non-Western countries, the question becomes, Why do others (Africans, for example) fail to assimilate Western norms? Is it because of differences of (role) perceptions, differences of values/judgments in the content of employee/manager schemas and behavioral scripts, or the extent to which individuals process information in an automatic or controlled manner (Shaw, 1990)? Are such differences of perceptions and values culturally determined, as indicated by Hofstede (1990)? The literature of the last two decades remains inconclusive on this issue.

Problems in the Concept of National Culture

Hofstede’s research and those of others have continued to stimulate interest in studying the influence of culture on management. However, this growing interest in recent years has raised more questions than it solved. It is important to note here that the sense of disagreement among researchers in comparative management about cultural influences are largely attributed to the difficulties researchers face in searching for sound theories of culture and appropriate methodologies to measure and study it.

[1] Power distance refers to the extent to which the society and its institutions accept power hierarchy and inequality as legitimate (Hofstede, 1980). Collectivism describes any values and practices that stress the importance of commitment to and harmony of the in-group (the collective mind), rather than the importance of the individual.

Monir Tayeb (1994) presented one of the most intriguing critiques of major methodological approaches and inadequacies in cross-cultural research. He defines problems of the study of culture in management in four areas “conceptualization, operationalization, data collection and interpretation, and study focus” (Tayeb, 1994: 430). Tayeb, 1994; Adler, 1993; Chapman, 1992 and Roberts and Boyacigiller (1984) argue that one of the major problems in the literature on culture and management is the lack of a well-agreed upon definition or meaning of culture that can be used across different groups or nations. Chapman (1992) argues that if culture is not defined, “how can it be operationalized? If it is not operationalized, how can it be measured? If it is not measured, how can it take its place in the scientific literature, with its multiple regression, its patterns of causation, and its ambitions of rigor?” (Chapman, 1992: 9). In the context of developing countries, the difficulty of studying culture emanates from the fact that the concepts of culture and nation-states and the meanings attached to them have been anchored, at least until recently, in the Western tradition which treats the concept of culture as something universal and therefore definable in terms that share comparable meanings across different groups or nations (Tayeb, 1994).

In Hofstede’s work the unit of analysis is the state, each of which is assumed to encompass a single nation (people) with its own culture. This fundamental assumption is questionable (Myers and Tan, 2002; Tayeb, 1994). This problem relates to the question of whether the boundaries of culture and state are the same. Tayed (1994) argued that the dominant approach within the existing cross-national management literature has been to equate states with cultures, and thus to assume that all managers within one state share similar cultural meanings and characteristics. The concept of nation-state is in fact problematic. First, it is a recent “Western” invention that in many cases does not correspond to any sense of cultural homogeneity or identity. Some “nation-states” have different cultures, nations, or subcultures within them. Indeed, it is only in the last 100 years that most states have been formed. Accordingly, Myers and Tan argued that there is a mismatch between the modern state (a recent phenomenon—a political entity that may have no common basis in race, language or culture) and culture (Myers and Tan, 2002). Many newly independent states in Africa and Asia were created by the colonial powers without any regard for cultural boundaries (i.e. the nations within). Furthermore, the state has continued to change in its form and makeup, particularly after the end of the Second World War and the breakdown of the Soviet Union (Al-Yahya, 2004; Myers and Tan, 2002). In these cases the concept of state does not correspond to any sense of cultural homogeneity or identity associated with the concept of nation-states. These realities are not limited to Third World countries. Great Britain is a good example, which consists of four major distinct cultural identities, the English, the Irish, the Scots, and the Welsh, not to mention the many more immigrant minorities who, along with the four major groups compose the so-called British organizations (Tayed, 1994; Chapman, 1992). On the other hand, groups like the Kurds share a common culture, which crosses national boundaries, but lack a state of their own.

Viewing culture as “complex and multidimensional,” Myers and Tan (2002) propose the adoption of a “more dynamic view of culture—one that sees culture as contested, temporal and emergent.” Therefore, levels of analysis should include not only national or international levels but also regional, business, and organizational ones. Myers and Tan are very skeptical about the use of national culture or identity because it is "something that is continually invented and reinvented (often by politicians). It is in effect, a moving target" (30). After gaining independence from France and Britain in 1980, for example, the new government of Vanuatu in the South-West Pacific sought to unify the nation around one language (previously it had 110 languages) and one national identity. The government of Singapore also embarked on a cultural change program aimed at fostering a more entrepreneurial and less risk averse culture (Myers and Tan, 2002).

Tayeb argues that some researchers tend to "ignore subtle socially-specific meanings of this kind and superimpose their own understanding of social constructs and concepts on other cultures." He goes on citing the "relative lack of reported studies that have attempted to examine the relationship between specific culturally-influenced work-related values and attitudes and specific structural variables" (Tayed, 1994:440). To illustrate this problem, Tayeb (1988; 1990) carefully and systematically examined the cultural coherence in three collectivist societies—Japan, Iran, and India. These societies were characterized by strong loyalty to the group or community, and workers were expected to exhibit collectivist values in their workplace in the form of a high degree of commitment, dedication, and emotional attachment to the work organization. However, after examining societal culture, employee attitudes and values and the management structure, Tayeb concluded, "it is only in Japan where the collectivism of Japan culture has been carried over into its companies. The Iranian and Indian employees are as detached from their work organizations and have as individualistic a relationship with their work places as any individualistic nation (Tayeb, 1994:440).

Some researchers responded to some of the methodological inadequacies associated with Hofstede's survey approach to the study of culture by engaging in more in-depth case studies and ethnographies of the relationship between culture and different aspects of global management (d'Iribarne, 1996; Trauth, 2000; Trauth and O'Connor, 1991; Hasan and Ditsa, 1999; Hill et al., 1998). Myers and Tan (2002) note that the ethnographic approach may provide a better and more precise understanding of cases being studied because it often uses multiple data gathering method including participant observation, open-ended interview, and documentary analysis. On the other hand, gains in depth of study are balanced by losses in comparativeness and generalizability of findings.

III. Culture and the New Public Management

Although major differences exist between administrative activities in the public and private sectors, as those outlined earlier, many concepts and techniques of public administration have been derived from the private sector practices. Indeed, a large body of administrative science is based on the assumption that the concept of management is universally applicable to every type of organization. Popular opinion as well as many experts support the view that private management is "the" management and cite private agencies as the success stories of our age. Like private managers, public managers are engaged in similar organizational activities, such as programs design, efficient spending of organizational resources, and meeting their staffing needs, motivating subordinates, and other management tasks. Even today, some scholars do not see the "public versus private" question to be so substantial and simply assume that public and private management are very much alike.

Looking at current trends in the US and abroad one can see an emerging market-driven mode of public administration. Public management adopted many businesslike transformations in the ever-popular forms of deregulation, liberalization, and some principles of TQM (Haque 1996). A few examples of such businesslike reforms in the public service are Public Service 2000 in Canada, Next Steps in the United Kingdom, Renewal of the Public Service in France, Financial Management Improvement Program in Australia, Administrative Management Project in Austria, Modernization Program for the Public Sector in Denmark, and Major Options Plan in Portugal (OECD 1993). This new genre of administrative reforms, often generalized as New Public Management, can also be found under various titles in Belgium, Brazil, Finland, Germany, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and Zambia (Haque, 1997; Nunberg 1997, 2002; OECD, 1995).

The interaction between public and private management will and should continue. Borrowing from the private sector to enhance government performance is a valid and useful project. However, as the case with transferring management models from one country to another, borrowing will only work not mindlessly, but carefully spelling out general management functions as well as considering the distinct public management functions and consciousness. Nunberg (2002) argues that the key to the successful adaptation of an externally derived model is to find the right "match between a given human resource management approach and particular developing-country circumstances." This is important, particularly in the civil service reforms because they "require both high-level policy changes as well as intricate administrative and behavioral shifts throughout the bureaucratic system… Civil service reforms, often linked to changes in the larger political and constitutional framework, require political commitment at multiple points within the polity" (63).

Allison (1999) recommended several activities to help further understanding and explanation of public sector management. Efforts should concentrate on developing cases studies on public management problems and practices, analyzing cases to find best practices (or worst practices), promoting systematic comparative research—similar functions (budgeting) in different environment (public versus private, or several public agencies), and linking findings to training of public managers. Hence we need to ask how can new public management (NPM) prescriptions be applied in developing countries? In many developing countries, where the private sector has been weak or nonexistent it is difficult to conceive of adopting unfamiliar practices from the private to the public sectors. On the other hand, public sector managers are more exposed to and driven by political, economic and social pressures. This tends to make more difficult and slower for public managers to adopt business-like management styles.

It was only recently that public administration scholars and practitioners, particularly proponents of the NPM, have come to recognize that public sector management and operations cannot be properly understood or evaluated outside the cultural environment or political culture of the host jurisdiction (Shafrtiz and Russell, 2000). The cultural context became an important factor that can explain the variations in the performance of public bureaucracies; it affects the quality, style and vigor of its processes and operations. NPM is a complex concept that manifests itself in a multifaceted reform package, which is sometimes generated and certified by international organizations like the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and major western donor countries (Christensen and Laegreid, 1999). Four models drive NPM: efficiency, downsizing and decentralization, the search of excellence, and public service orientation (Ferlie et al., 1996). Like societal culture, which influences the scope and direction of institutional performance and change, NPM's broad reforms provide institutional changes, namely those affecting expenditure planning and financial management, civil service and labor relations, procurement, audit and evaluation, contract systems, accountability and responsiveness.

From a cultural-institutional perspective, the process by which political-administrative systems and public organizations are transformed to achieve the NPM reform goals is very slow and gradual, more evolutionary rather than revolutionary and more informal rather than formal (Selznick, 1957, 1996). The degree and speed of institutional change and managerial reform should be significantly matched with the external (national culture) and internal (organizational) environment. This perspective rests on the assumption that managerial reforms that are incompatible with the traditional political-administrative cultural and historical norms will likely be modified or resisted, whereas those that are more compatible gradually will be implemented (Christensen and Laegrid, 1999). This emphasis on consistency and congruence certainly represents a challenge to enthusiastic leaders and development management consultants who have to cope with developing and handling management reforms in environment which may be incompatible with local administrative-cultural traditions. The definition and content of any structural reform vary between countries based on their social structure, cultural orientations towards market, institutional environment, economic resources, level of economic development, and level of savings (Marcou, 1997).

Conclusions

The impact of culture as an important contingency on the applicability of Western management to developing countries remains an important empirical question in the development and comparative management literature. While it is not possible at this juncture to fully define the nature of the relationship, substantial advances have been made in conceptualizing the problem, identifying the key variables, operationalizing those variables in a replicable format, and providing new empirical data and analysis.

It has been recognized that culture is much more complex and dynamic than has been assumed and that studying cultural differences purely in terms of national culture is "overly simplistic" (Myers and Tan, 2002). Traditionally, culture has been defined at the national level, but recent research indicates that culture may be more appropriately defined at the group, organizational, and even international levels, (e.g., "African" culture, "Middle Eastern" culture and "European" culture and so on) (Newman and Nollen, 1996; Schuller and Rogvsky, 1998). Recent studies have shown that cultural factors at different levels play an important role in the choice and efficiency of management practices. Many scholars suggest that the alignment of management practices to existing behavioral expectations and social orientations that transcend the workplace has produced desirable organizational outcomes (Newman and Nollen, 1996; Murphy, 1999). Others, while recognizing the importance of culture, particularly on global management with its growing emphasis on integration and cooperation, call for more interaction between managers who possess different values and work orientations. This is a way to bridge gaps between different cultural and managerial elements and foster a more integrative and uniform management style along with efforts by governments and other organizations to mandate cultural (and educational) change that makes easier the adoption of comparable management practices (Myers and Tan, 2002; Smith, 1998). These authors call for more comprehensive models that not only capture the relationship between culture and particular management practices but also address the extent of culture changes and the relative impact of culture in relation to other important factors such as institutional arrangements (Florkowski and Schuler, 1994; Schuler, Dowling and DeCieri, 1994), economic conditions; social customs (Schuler and Rogovsky, 1998); national standards and capacities; and national and local resources—human, physical, and financial.

Many development management theories advocate institutional development and skill enhancement based on a western management perspective as the way to ensure democratic governance, economic development and growth. The prime implication is that Western management models and the skills required to implement them effectively are directly relevant for developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. According to this argument, Africa, for example, has performed less well than other regions primarily because of the incapacity of indigenous leaders and managers to internalize and apply modern (i.e., Western) management in the local cultural context. “Policy reformers” suggest structural reforms in the way Third World governments conduct their affairs. For these, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, the relevance, hence the transferability, of Western management experience is not a question which is open to debate.

From a strictly managerial standpoint, structural adjustment has intentionally aimed at promoting a comprehensive restructuring and coordination of Third World countries’ public, parasitical, and private sector organizations so as to make them individually and collectively more productive and to contribute more effectively, on a sustainable basis, to their development goals (Kiggundu, 1989). It is assumed that a policy reorientation toward private sector development and more exposure to Western management experience are part of the solution.

As noted by Moore (1987) the successful implementation of policy reform is limited in part by the absence of a clear understanding of the institutional and administrative requirements for sustained and sustainable reform efforts. He contends that (today) the failure in the search for efficiency and effectiveness resides in the “limited groundwork that has been done with regard to a realistic understanding of the complexity of institutional, political, and economic impact that inhere in policy reform” (Moore, 1987: 4). Therefore, there is a need to focus explicitly on the issue of implementation, which involves the task of a strategic mapping or tracing exercise, to provide a means for preempting the potential bottlenecks—including culture contingencies—in implementing reform.

Although it is all too common to suggest that additional research is necessary, in this case it is clearly called for. We firmly believe that the scholars concerned with development management are on the verge of a breakthrough in identifying not only the impact of culture on management in specific societies-nations but the dynamics of change in this relationship and the sources of such change as well. Although globalization has become a widely discussed theme, the relationship between its various manifestations, such as privatization, economic integration, cross-national acquisition and mergers, deregulation, and transformations of management, communication, and employment systems, and different cultural dimensions has not been fully explored in a broader cross-national research. Except for few studies (such as Hofstede, 1980; Newman and Nollen, 1996; Ronen and Shenkar, 1985; Brodbeck et al, 2000; Myers et al, 1995), comparative management research has not been all-encompassing of this internationalization process, focusing instead on countries from one regional cluster or on a small number of countries selected from different regions in the world, sometimes assuming that one country is representative of a larger geographical and cultural region (e.g., Mexico for Latin America, Japan or China for Asia, France or United States for the West, and so on).

Future cross-national studies may consider a broader sample of countries or cultures as well as subcultures to generate a better understanding of how a nation’s social-political conditions affect various aspects of human resources management. This should be accompanied by more cross-national collaboration in an attempt to share best practices, particularly those learned from the increasing cross-border mergers, acquisition and joint ventures. These efforts also have to take into account the changing personality or nature of a nation’s cultural values that globally may be changing. This necessitates the need for a more integrative and comprehensive approaches to managing behavior, structure, and processes, and adjusting management strategies accordingly. These initiatives should not be limited to the private sector, but focus also on the public sector organizations. Most cross-national studies have been based on data derived from the private sector organizations with little emphasis on the potential differences between private and public sectors. This chapter highlights contemporary research on the important issue of the link between cultural values and perceptions and management practices. It emphasizes the need for matching new structural arrangements with national and local cultures or subcultures to avoid conflict with ethnic, religious or cultural interests; this requires the attention of central governments in assigning responsibilities and resources.

Bibliography

Abramo, Lais, The Sociology of Work in Latin America: A Complex Development and Current Challenges, *Work and Occupations*, 28(3):305-335, 1998.

Adler, Nancy J., and Suzan Bartholomew, Academic and Professional Communities of Discourse: Generating Knowledge on Transnational Human Resource Management, *Journal of International Business Studies* 23(3):551-570, 1992.

Ahiauzu, A. I., The African Thought-System and the Work Behavior of the African Industrial Main, *International Studies of Management & Organization* 16 (2):37-58, 1986.

Alexander, D. Larry, The Effect Level in the Hierarchy and Functional Area Have on the Extent Mintzberg's Roles Are Required by Managerial Jobs, *Academy of Management* 186-189,1979.

Ali, Abbas, Abdul Aziz Taqi & Krish Krishnan, Individualism, Collectivism, and Decision Style of Managers in Kuwait, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, v.137, n. 5, pp. 629-637, 1997.

Ali, A., Islamic Work Ethic in Arabia, *Journal of Psychology*, 126, 507-519.

Allison, Graham, Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects?, in Frederick Lane (eds.), *Public Administration: Current Issues,* Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.

Al-Yahya, Khalid and Richard Vengroff. 2004. Human Capital Utilization, Empowerment, and Organizational Effectiveness: Saudi Arabia in Comparative Perspective. *Journal of Global Development Studies*, No. 3-4, Vol. 3. PP. 251-295.

Arbelaez, Harvey, and Glaudio Milman, The Business Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean, *International Journal of Public Administration*, New York, 23(5-8): 1253-1268, 2000.

Bakhtari, Hassan, Cultural Effects on Management Style: A Comparative Study of American and Middle Eastern Management Styles (Management and its Environment in the Arab World), *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 25 (3):97-118, Fall, 1995.

Berg, Robert J. and Whitaker, Jennifer S., *Strategies for African Development*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1986.

Berry, John, Ype Poortinga, and Jamak Pandey, *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Volume 1 Theory and Method*, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1997

Bjur, Wesley E. and Zomorrodian, Ashgar, Towards Indigenous Theories of Administration, *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 52:393-420,1986.

Bond, M. (Ed.), *The Cross-Cultural Challenge to Social Psychology*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1988.

Bourgoin, Henry, *L'Afrique Malade du Management*, Paris, Ed. Jean Picollec.

Brewster, Chris, Towards a 'European' Model of Human Resource Management, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(1): 1-21, 1994.

Brodbeck, Felix et al., Cultural Variation of Leadership Prototypes Across 22 European Countries, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, March, 73 (2), 2000.

Bryant, Coralie and White, Louise G., *Managing Developing in the Third World*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colo., 1982.

Calori, R., Lubatkin, M., Very, P. & Veiga, J., Modeling the Origins of Nationally-Bound Administrative Heritage: A Historical Institutional Analysis of French and British Firms Managing Acquisition, *Organizational Science*, 1997, 8(6): 681-696.

Carlos, Luiz, Bresser Pereira, and Peter Spink, *Reforming the State: Managerial Public Administration in Latin America,* Boulder, CO, & London: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Chapman, Malcolm, Defining Culture: a Social Anthropological Perspective, paper presented to the 1992 Annual Conference of the Academy of International Business (U.K.), Brighton Polytechnic Business School, 26-27 March (Quoted in Tayeb, 1994).

Christensen, Tom and Per Laegreid, New Public Management-Design, Resistance, or Transformation? *Public Productivity and Management Review*, San Francisco, Dec.1999.

Clausen, J.A., Perspectives on Childhood Socialization, in *Socialization and Society* (J.A. Clausen, ed.), Little, Brown, Boston, 1968, pp.153-167.

Crozier, Michel and Friedberg, Erhard, *Actors and Systems, the Politics of Collective Action*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1980.

Deny, Ian, The Failure of Success and the Success of Failure: The Youth Polytechnic Programme in Kenya, *Public Administration and Development* 10:179-198, 1990.

d'Iribarne, P, The Usefulness of an Ethnographic Approach to the International Comparison of Organizations, *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 26(4), 30-47, 1996/1997.

Diaz-Guerrero, R., Origin and Development of Psychology in Latin America, *International Journal of Psychology*, 29, 717-727, 1994.

Duenas, Guillermo, Cultural Aspects in the Integration of the Americas, *International Journal of Public Administration,* New York, 23(5-8): 1517-1529, 2000.

Durojaiye, M., Indigenous Psychology in Africa: The Search for meaning, in U. Kim and J. Berry (eds.), *Indigenous Psychologies: Research and Experience in Cultural Context*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 211-220, 1993.

Ferlie, E., et al., *The New Public Management in Action*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Florkowski, Gary W. and Randall S. Schuler, Auditing Human Resource Management in the Global Environment, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5: 827-51, 1994.

Hage, Herald and Finsterbush, Kurt, *Organizational Change as Development Strategy: Models and Tactics for Improving Third World Organizations*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1987.

Haque, M, Recent Changes in Asian Public Service in the Context of Privatization, in IIAS (eds.) *Public Administration and Development*, IIAS/UN, pp.43-65, 1997.

Hasan, H., & Ditsa, G., The impact of culture on the adoption of IT: An Interpretive Study, *Journal of Global Information Management*, 7(1), 5-15, 1999.

Heady, Ferrel, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1984.

Heuer, Mark, Jeffrey L. Cummings and Winfred Hutabarat, Cultural Stability or Change Among Managers in Indonesia? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30 (3):599, Fall 1999.

Hickson, D.J., The Culture-Free Context of Organization Structure: A Trinational Comparison, *Sociology* 8:59-81, 1974.

Hill, C. E., Loch, K. D., Straub, D. W., & El-Sheshai, K, A Qualitative Assessment of Arab Culture and Information Technology Transfer, *Journal of Global Information Management*, 6(3), 29-38, 1998.

Hofstede, Geert, Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad? *Organizational Dynamics,* Summer (1980).

Hofstede, Geert, *Culture's Consequences*, Sage, 1984.

Hofstede, Geert and Bond, Michael Harris, The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth, *Organizational Dynamics* 16(4):4-21 (1988).

Hyden, Goran, *No Shortcuts to Progress: African Development Management in Perspective*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983.

Jackson, Susan and Randall Schuler, Understanding Human Resource Management in the Context of Organizations and their Environment, *Applied Review of Psychology*, 46:237-264, 1995.

Kiggundu, Moses N., *Managing Organizations in Developing Countries*, Kumarian Press, Hartford, Conn., 1989.

Kluckholn, Florence R. & Frederick L. Strodtbeck, *Variations in Value Orientation,* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1961.

Lau, Alan W. and Broedlinng, Laurie, The Future of Managerial Work in the Public Sector, *Public Management Forum*, September/October: 513-520, 1980.

Laurent, Andre, *The Cultural Diversity of Western Concepts of Management, in Managing in Different Cultures* (Pat Joynt and Malcolm Warner, eds.), Universitetsforlaget AS, Oslo, 1985, pp. 41-56.

Lauter, G.P., Socio-Cultural and Legal Factors Impeding Decentralization in Developing Countries, *Adamancy of Management Journal* 12:367-378, 1969.

Leonard, K. David, *Reaching the Peasant Farmer: Organization Theory and Practice in Kenya,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1977.

Lessem, R., & Neubauer, F., *European Management Systems*, London: McGraw-Hill, 1994.

Lindholm, Niklas, National Culture and Performance Management in MNC Subsidiaries (Multinational Companies), *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 29 (4):4, Winter, 1999.

Lubatkin, Michael, Momar Ndiaye, Richard Vengroff, The Nature of Managerial Work in Developing Countries: A Limited Test of the Universalist Hypothesis, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28 (4):711-733, 1997.

Lubatkin, Michael, Richard Vengroff, Momar Ndiaye and John Veiga, Managerial Work and Management Reform in Senegal: The Influence of Hierarchy and Sector, *American Review of Public Administration*, 29:240-268, 1999.

Lubatkin, M., Calori, R., Very, P. & Veiga, J., Managing Mergers Across Borders: A Two Nation Test of Nationally Bound Administrative Heritage, *Organizationa Science,* 1998, 9(6): 670-684.

Marcou, Gerard, The Role of the State and the Future of Public Services Faced with the Problems of Transition and Development: Proposal for a Methodology, in IIAS (eds.) *Public Administration and Development*, IIAS/UN, pp.11-30, 1997.

Michael, James, A Conceptual Framework for Aligning Managerial Behaviors with Cultural Work Values, *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 7 (3/4): 81-101, 1997.

Misumi, Jyuji, *The Behavioral Science of Leadership*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1985.

Mintzberg, Henry, The Manager's Job: Folklore and Facts, *Harvard Business Review*, 53 (4):49-61 (1971a).

Mintzberg, Henry, Managerial Work: Analysis from Observation in the Great Writings in *Management and Organizational Behavior* 2nd ed., (Boone, E. Louis and Bowen, Donland D., eds), Random House, Harper and Row, New York, 1971b.

Mintzberg, Henry, Managerial Work, Harper and Row, New York, 1973.

Montgomery, John, *Improving Management in Southern Africa*, final report to the Regional Training Council of Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference, National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), Washington, DC., 1985a.

Montgomery, John, *Probing Managerial Behavior: Image and Realty in Southern Africa*, paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association, Madison, Wisc., Madison, October 26-November 1, 1986-1985b.

Montgomery, John, The African Manager: *Management Review* XXVI (2):82-111 (1985c).

Montgomery, John, Life at the Apex: The Functions of Permanent Secretaries in Nine Southern African Countries, *Public Administration and Development*, 6:211-221 (1986a).

Montgomery, John, Bureaucratic Politics in Southern Africa, *Public Administration Review*, 46(5):407-413 (1986b).

Montgomery, John, Levels of Managerial Leadership in Southern Africa, *Journal of Developing Areas* 21:15-30, 1986.

Montgomery, John, How African Managers Serve Development Goals, *Comparative Politics Review*, 347-360, April 1987.

Moore, Richard J., Unpublished. *Management Requirements of Policy Reform: A Strategic Mapping of Implementation Bottlenecks*, The American University, Washington, D.C., December 9-10, 1988.

Murphy, William H., Hofstede's National Culture as a Guide for Sales Practices, *Australian Journal of Management*, 24 (1):37, June 1999.

Myers, Andrews; Andrew Kakabadse; Tim McMahon; Gilles Spony, Top Management Styles in Europe: Implications for Business and Cross-national Teams, *European Business Journal,* 7(1):17-28, Winter 1995

Myers, Michael D. and Felix B. Tan. Beyond Models of National Culture in Information Systems Research, *Journal of Global Information Management*, 10 (1):24-32, Jan-March 2002.

Neghandi, Anant R., *Manager in the Third World, in Managing in Different Cultures* (Pat Joynt and Malcolm Warner, eds.), Universitetsforlaget AS, Oslo, pp.69-97, 1985.

Newman, Karen and Stanley Nollen, Culture and Congruence: The Fit Between Management Practices and National Culture, *Journal of International Business Studies*, London, 27(4): 753-779, Fourth Quarter 1996.

Nunberg, Barbara, Exporting Administrative Excellence: Adapting Advanced-Country Models to Developing Contexts, in Carolyn Ban and Norma Riccucci (eds.), *Public Personnel Management: Current Concerns, Future Challenges*, Addison Wesley Longmen, 2002, pp. 52-71.

Nzelibe, C.C., The Evolution of Management Thought, *International Studies of Management and Organization,* 16(2):6-16, 1986.

OECD, *Governance in Transition: Public Management Reform in OECD Countries*, Paris: OECD, 1996.

Osland, Joyce, Monteze Snyder, and Leslie Hunter, A Comparative Study of Managerial Styles among Female executives in Nicaragua and Costa Rica, *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 28(2): 54, Summer 1998.

Pelled, Lisa and Katherine Xin, Work Values and their Human Resource Management Implications: A Theoretical Comparison of China, Mexico, and the United States, *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 6 (2): 185-198, 1997.

Riggs, Fred, *Administration in Developing Countries: Theory of the Prismatic Society*. Boston, 1964.

Riggs, W. Fred, *Prismatic Society Revisited,* General Learning Press, Morristown, 1973.

Roberts, K. H., and N. Boyacigiller, *Cross-National Organizational Research—the Grasp of the Blind Men in Research in Organizational Behavior*, in B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (eds.), 417-451. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1984.

Ronen, Simcha and Oded Shenkar, Clustering Countries on Attitudinal Dimensions: A Review and Synthesis, *Academy of Management Review*, 10, pp435-54, 1985.

Salk, Jane E. and Mary Yoko Brannen, National Culture, Networks, and Individual Influence in a Multinational Management Team, *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, (2):191-202, Mississippi State; April 2000.

Schuler, Randal and Nikolai Rogovsky, Understanding Compensation Practice Variations Across Firms: The Impact of National Culture, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1: 159-177, Spring 1998.

Schuler, Randall S., Peter J. Dowling & Helen DeCieri, An Integrative Framework of Strategic Human Resource Management, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(4): 717-64, 1994.

Schuler, Randall S. and Gary W. Florkowski, International Human Resource Management, In Punnett, B. J. and O. Shenkar, eds., *Handbook for International Management Research*. London:Blackwell Publishers, 351-90, 1996.

Shafrtiz, Jay and E.W. Russell, *Public Administration*, New York: Longman, 2000.

Shaw, James B., A Cognitive Categorization Model for the Study of Intercultural Management, *Adamancy of Management Review* 15(4):626-645, 1990.

Sinha, D., Indigenizing Psychology in Berry, John, Ype Poortinga, and Jamak Pandey, *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Volume 1 Theory and Method*, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1997, pp.129-169.

Smith, M., Culture and Organizational Change, *Management Accounting*, 76(7): 60-62, 1998.

Smith, M., Peter B., Jyoji Misumi, Monir H. Tayeb, Mark F. Peterson, and Michael H. Bond, On the Generality of Leadership Style Measures Across Cultures, *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 62: 97-109, 1989.

Selznick, P., *Leadership in Administration*, New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Selznick, P., Institutionalism “Old” and “New,” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, June 1996, 41(2):270-278.

Tayeb, Monir H., *Organizations and National Culture: A Comparative Analysis*, London: Sage, 1988.

Tayeb, Monir, Organizations and National Culture: Methodology Considered, *Organization Studies:* Special Issue on Cross-National Organization Culture, 15(3): 429-446, Summer 1994.

The IIAS and the United Nations, *Public Administration and Development: Improving Accountability, Responsiveness, and Legal Framework*, Amsterdam: IIAS, 1997.

Trauth, E. M., Achieving the Research Goal with Qualitative Research Methods: Lessons Learned Along the Way, In A. S. Lee & J. Liebenau & J. I. DeGross (Eds.), *Information Systems and Qualitative Research*, London: Chapman Hall, 1997.

Trauth, E. M., The Culture of an Information Economy: Influences and Impacts in the Republic of Ireland. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.

Trauth, E. M., & O'Connor, B., A Study of the Interaction Between Information Technology and Society: An Illustration of Combined Qualitative Research Methods, in H. E. Nissen & H. K. Klein & R. Hirschheim (eds.), *Information Systems Research: Contemporary Approaches and Emergent Traditions,* Amsterdam: North-Holland 1991.

Veiga, J., Lubatkin, M., Tung, A., Calori, R. & Very, P., A Note on Using Neural Network Analysis to Uncover the Trace Effects of National Culture, *Journal of International Business Strategy*, 2000, 31(2): 223-238.

Vengroff, Richard, *Rural Development, policy Reforms and the Assessment of Management Training Needs in Africa: A Comparative Perspective*, paper prepared for Delivery at the Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association, Chicago, October 27-30, 1988.

Vengroff, Richard, *Senegal M.A.P.S. Formal Sector Survey*, paper prepared for Labat Anderson Incorporated, Arlington, Va., 1990.

Vengroff, R., Belhaj, M., and Ndiaye, M., The Nature of Managerial Work in the Public Sector: An African Perspective, *Public Administration and Development* 11:95-110, 1991.

Very, P., Lubatkin, M., Calori, R. & Veiga, J., Relative Standing and the Performance of Recent European Mergers, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(8): 593-615, 1997.

Warwick, Donald P., Culture and the Management of Family Planning Programs*,* *Studies in Family Planning* 19(1):1-18, 1988.

Table 1: Key Approaches, Hypotheses, Variables and Measures in the Study of Culture and Management

Approach	*Key Hypotheses/Assumptions*	*Key Variables/Measures*
Universalist (Management-Western-Best-Practices)	*Universality of Western Management Practices* -Work values are similar from one setting to another regardless of differences in national cultures. (Mintzberg, 1971, 1973; Hickson, 1974; Leonard, 1977; Hage and Finsterbush, 1987; Drentch, 1985; Lau, Newman & Broedling, 1980; Montgomery, 1985, 1986; Vengroff, 1988, 1990; Lubatkin et al, 1997; Salk & Brannen, 2000)	Managerial work roles: -interpersonal roles -informational roles -decisional roles
	-Impact of organizational structures and functions on managerial roles. -Culture plays minor role in determining work values. (Alexander, 1979; Montgomery, 1985,1986; Vengroff, 1988, 1990, Lubatkin et al, 1997; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1987; Perry & Rainy, 1988)	Managerial roles Manager's level in hierarchy Manager's functional area Public versus private sector Interaction of sector and hierarchy Size of enterprise Organizational structure
	-Work preferences and values in multinational teams—no systematic differences (Salk & Brannen, 2000).	Centrality, influence, formal position, tenure, co-worker relationships, task-related communications
Convergence -Divergence Continuum	*Crossvergence Hypothesis* -Higher-order dimensional continuum. -The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial work values. (Ralston, Holt, Terptra; & Kai-Cheng, 1997)	Culture (Individualistic-Collectivist) and economic ideology (Capitalist-Socialist) -Individualism-collectivism -Openness-to-change-conservation -Self-enhancement-self-transcendence
	Convergence Hypothesis (Clausen, 1968; Lauter, 1969; Hyden, 1983; Salk & Brannen; Lubatkin et al, 1997;	Management styles converge according to: -Level of industrialization and economic development -Level of education and skill

	Ralston et al, 1997; Negandhi, 1979; Heuer, 1999)	-Incorporation in global economy -Influence of MNCs and foreign competition -Organizational and functional differentiation
Cultural Contingency (Congruence)	*Congruence Hypothesis* -Management practice-culture fit -Management practices must be matched to cultural context. -Congruence influences organizational outcomes (Newman & Nollen, 1996; Probst et al, 2000; Murphy, 1999; Lindholm, 1999; Kluckholn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Jackson & Schuler, 1995; Pelled and Xin, 1997; Breu, 2001, Myers & Tan, 2002; Murphy, 1999; Hill et al, 1998; Tayeb, 1988)	-Organizational performance (profitability, productivity, flexibility) -Employee participation & empowerment -Compensation and award -Clarity of direction and goals (Newman & Nollen, 1996) -Continuous improvement (Probst et al, 2000) -Sales practices -Compensation and special incentives -Control mechanism - Information Technology Transfer (Hill et al, 1998) -Communication (Murphy, 1999) -Performance Management: Evaluation and feedback, setting of job objectives (Lindholm, 1999) -Organizational change (Breu, 2001)
	-Differences in management styles and leadership concepts across European countries reflect cultural differences -Relationship between societal culture diversity and diversity in management styles. (Brodbeck et al, 2000; Kakabadse, 1993; Myers et al, 1995; Brewster, 1994; Laurent, 1985)	-Interpersonal directness, proximity, autonomy, modesty, commitment, Team collaboration and integration, conflict (Brodbeck et al, 2000) -Differences in orientations towards level of consensus, managing from a distance, leading from the front -Influence on the degree of job satisfaction, internal relationships, organizational performance, process of change management (Kakabadse, 1993; Myers et al, 1995)
Culture-Specific Theory of Management	*Culturalist (divergence) Hypothesis* -Management styles and organizational structures and processes reflect the cultural	*Multiple Cultural Dimensions*: -Power distance; uncertainty avoidance; individualism-collectivism; and masculinity-femininity; Confucian dynamism (Hofstede,

	environment in which they are developed. -Western management styles are not universally applicable -No one way of doing things *-Indigenous cultural psychology:* Distinct psychological/cultural processes and meanings exist between countries or clusters of countries and thus administrative science should match sociocultural realities. (Heady, 1984; Riggs, 1973; Crozier and Friedberg, 1980; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1988; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1993; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Newman & Nollen, 1996; Neghandi, 1986; Kiggundu, 1989; Triandis, 1995; Triandis et al., 1988; Nzelibe, 1986; Ahiauzu, 1986; Warwick, 1988; Tayeb, 1994, 1988; Smith et al, 1989, Myers & Tan, 2002; Ralston, et al, 1997; Brodbeck et al, 2000; Kakabadse, 1993; Myers et al, 1995; Berry, 1978; Bond, 1988)	1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1988). Analysis-integration; achievement-ascription; universalism-particularism; & orientation toward the environment (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1993). *Single Cultural Dimension:* -High context-low context -Monochronic- polychronic (Hall, 1960, 1976; Lewis, 1992; Triandis, 1995; Triandis et al., 1988; Myers & Tan, 2002) -Pragmatism - Idealism/ Wholism -Rationalism – Humanism (Lessem & Neubauer, 1994) *Indigenous cultural psychology:* Emphasis on culture-specific factors (Berry, 1974; Berry, Poortinga & Pandey, 1997; Bond, 1988; Diaz-Guerrero, 1977, 1994; Jahoda, 1990; Sinha, 1997; Durojaiye, 1993)