

Getting Grip on Cross-Cultural Research:
The Effect of Different Power Distance Contexts on Reactions to
Voice

Universiteit Utrecht

Master Sociale Psychologie

Thesis en Stage (45 ECTS)

Michael van den Oudenalder, 3019896

17 juni 2011

Onder begeleiding van prof. dr. Kees van den Bos

Tweede beoordelaar: dr. Esther Papies

Abstract

Previous research has shown that people from different power distance cultures respond differently to affective items when they are given, versus being denied, voice in a decision to be made. The current research tries to improve upon these conclusions by using a recently developed procedure and modifying it to suit the current research. In this procedure, besides passively measuring the cultural dimension in the control condition, the countercultural norm will be made salient in the experimental condition, strengthening any conclusions that will be drawn about the cross-cultural differences. Using this new procedure in two separate studies, evidence is provided for the predictions that the Netherlands constitutes a low power distance culture (Study 1), whereas India constitutes a high power distance culture (Study 2), as well as its implications on people's reaction to voice. Implications for future research on cross-cultural differences are discussed.

Introduction

Imagine a Friday afternoon in France, being on the road with two friends traveling through Europe on a roadtrip, trying to find a place to camp for the night. You arrive at a promising camping in the south of France; quiet, but not too quiet, friendly faces greeting you, and enough beautiful grassland to house a festival. You and your friends try to locate the reception to check in, and after finding it all the way at the back of the camping, it appears to be closed. Lost for a solution, you approach one of the friendly-looking people mowing one of the grassy fields on a motorized mower. After signaling you want to talk, the man shuts down the mower and approaches you with a friendly *bonjour*. “Bonjour,” you answer in broken French, “can we check in for the night? The reception seems to be closed.” Looking for words, the friendly man replies “the reception is in the back!” “We know, but it is closed.” “Ah,” answers the man, “you want to stay?” “Yes,” you reply, “we’d like to stay for one night.” “One night,” the man parrots. “With tent?” “Yes, we have two tents.” “Ah, *bon*. You want to stay here? Tonight?” “Yes,” you answer, “if that’s possible.” The man answers plainly “sorry, but we’re closed.”

This is just one of the adventures me and my two friends experienced during a roadtrip through Europe in the spring of 2010. Needless to say, soon after this encounter we traveled on, searching for a camping that *was* open. Even though this might be more of an example of a language barrier than anything else, it makes you wonder: what must the friendly Frenchman have thought when we approached him about being able to stay for the night? Was it not obvious we wanted to stay *this* night rather than some other night? Might there even be a different way in which people from different countries or cultures react in such a situation, or in fact in any situation?

Indeed, there are a lot of differences to be found between the different cultures on our planet, and a lot of interesting research has been focused on revealing these differences and on finding an explanation for them. One of the most comprehensive researches on cross-cultural differences has been performed by prof. dr. Geert Hofstede. In his 2001 book *Culture’s Consequences*, Hofstede explains the research he has done with IBM employees across more than 40 countries between 1967 and 1973. In his research, he compared the participants on several levels, which resulted in 4 dimensions that can be used to differentiate between cultures. These dimensions are *power distance*, *individualism*, *masculinity* and *uncertainty avoidance* (Hofstede, 2001). These dimensions can be seen as the level at which a culture possesses that particular cultural norm.

Subsequent cross-cultural research has used these and other paradigms to compare different cultures and to locate differences between these cultures. One trend within these researches has been to take participants from two cultures that supposedly differ on one or more cultural dimensions and measure the effect these differences supposedly have on specific behavior, mediating the results to see whether the supposed cultural differences indeed explain the behavioral differences. A problem with this approach lies in the fact that it does not explain *where* differences between cultures come from; they merely show there *is* a difference.

A different approach to cross-cultural research can be found in two studies performed by Van den Bos et al. (2010). In their research, they compared two cultures (the United States and the Netherlands) on the level of culturally-determined masculinity and femininity (as defined by Hofstede, 2001). They predicted that in masculine cultures (e.g. the United States) or in contexts that emphasize competitive achievement, those with higher performance capabilities will feel empowered to have input in decisions and, hence, will desire opportunities to voice their opinions about decisions to be made. On the other hand, they predicted that in feminine cultures (e.g. the Netherlands) or in contexts that emphasize the importance of nurturing people with lower capability, those with lower capabilities will feel valued as important group members, will feel worthy of receiving voice and, hence, will appreciate opportunities to voice their opinions about decisions to be made. Besides measuring the reaction of participants in both cultures receiving either voice or no voice in a decision to be made, Van den Bos et al. (2010) also elicited countercultural norms in half of the participants from each culture. Thus, in the experimental condition in the United States (Study 1), the femininity value of nurturance was emphasized, whereas in the experimental condition in the Netherlands (Study 2), the masculinity value of competitive achievement was emphasized. Measuring the effect of these countercultural conditions on reactions to voice and comparing them to the control conditions in which no countercultural norm was made salient could give the researchers a much more precise insight into the effects of cross-cultural differences on people's reactions, as well as give an explanation for these differences. Or as Van den Bos et al. (2010) put it:

To the extent that the results in the countercultural (experimental) conditions meaningfully differ from those observed in the control conditions in which no values are emphasized explicitly, we can gain greater insight into the psychological dimensions that account for cross-cultural differences in people's reactions. (p. 640)

Both studies indeed showed a significant difference between the control condition and the experimental condition. This gave the researchers firmer ground to stand on when suggesting that the different results expected to arise in the control conditions in the American sample in Study 1 and in the Dutch sample in Study 2 are attributable to differences in the importance that members of the two cultures assign to the values associated with masculinity and femininity.

In line with the new approach to cross-cultural research as pioneered by Van den Bos et al. (2010), the current research focuses on cross-cultural differences not only by simply measuring them, but also by introducing an experimental condition wherein a countercultural norm is made saillant. This is done to strengthen possible conclusions about cross-cultural differences.

Procedural justice and power distance

Where the Van den Bos et al. (2010) study focuses on masculinity, the current research will focus on another dimension as defined by Hofstede (2001): power distance. Power distance is defined by Hofstede as "...the extent to which the less powerful members of organisations and institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. This represents inequality, defined from below, not from above. It suggests that a society's level of inequality is endorsed by the followers as much as by the leaders." (Hofstede, 2001). In short, the level of power distance represents the level to which the people in a given population accept the inequality of power. This means that, for instance, the authority of the police is generally more respected in a high power distance culture than in a low power distance culture.

To examine what effect a difference in power distance has on behavior, we first take a look at a study on cross-cultural differences in power distance, performed by Brockner et al. (2001). In their research, Brockner et al. (2001) compared participants from different cultures, and different levels of power distance, in their response to obtaining (versus being denied) voice in a decision-making process. It was hypothesized that the magnitude of this voice effect varied across cultures. In three consecutive experiments they showed that people from low power distance cultures responded less favorably to lower levels of voice than people from high power distance cultures. This suggests that people from high power distance cultures don't expect power from their leaders (as is described in Hofstede's definition) and as a result are not very disappointed when they indeed get no voice.

The independent variable used in the above study to manipulate the amount of voice participants get in a situation where a decision is to be made is a so-called *procedural justice* variable. Procedural justice concerns the fact that people will react more favorably to decisions based on procedures believed to be fair than those believed to be unfair. The current research will use the same procedural justice manipulation as the one that is used in Brockner et al. (2001) to measure people's reactions to different levels of power distance. However, in line with the research by Van den Bos et al. (2010), the current research will improve upon the experimental design, as it is used in Brockner et al. (2001), by introducing a manipulation of a countercultural power distance norm in the experimental condition.

India and the Netherlands

When reviewing research on power distance in the literature, Western cultures (e.g. USA, England, Germany) are often portrayed as being low power distance cultures, whereas Asian cultures (People's Republic of China, Hong Kong, Japan) are often portrayed as being high power distance cultures. According to Hofstede's IBM research however, India scores relatively high on the power distance index, scoring 77 points compared to a world average of 56.5 and an Asian average of 64 (Hofstede, 2001). Even so, it is mostly omitted from research into cultural differences in power distance. It might be interesting to see if the current research can confirm India to be a high power distance culture, as predicted by Hofstede's (2001) IBM research.

In contrast to India, the Netherlands is considered to be a low power distance culture, with a power distance index of 38. Besides testing whether India can be seen as a high power distance culture, it might also be interesting to see whether its level of power distance differs significantly from that of a low power distance culture like the Netherlands. Therefore, in the current study, these two cultures will be the focus of our interest.

The current research

In summary, the current research will examine the effects of power distance on people's reactions toward obtaining (vs. being denied) voice. In this sense it's a replication of the research done by Brockner et al. (2001). However, in line with Van den Bos et al. (2010), the current research will not just focus on measuring culturally-determined power distance in both India and the Netherlands, but it will also introduce an experimental condition wherein a countercultural norm is made salient. This will grant us further evidence when comparing

these two cultures on their culturally-determined level of power distance and its effect on people's reactions toward obtaining or being denied voice. Study 1 will focus on the Netherlands, where Study 2 will focus on India. In Study 1, the experimental condition will induce a high power distance context, running counter to the predominant power distance in the Netherlands. The same will be done in Study 2 for India, but here, a low power distance context will be induced. To my knowledge, manipulating the level of power distance in participants is a novelty within the field of cross-cultural psychology. The method used to do this is explained in detail in the method section of Study 1. Finally, in both studies, the control condition will induce nothing to provide us with a default power distance condition for each culture.

I expect the control condition in the Netherlands (Study 1) to show results similar to those found in the low power distance countries in Brockner et al. (2001). In other words, people in this condition will respond very unfavorably to being denied voice, and very favorably to obtaining voice. In the same way, I expect the control condition in India (Study 2) to show results similar to those found in the high power distance countries in Brockner et al. (2001). People in this condition will only respond moderately unfavorably to being denied voice, and only moderately favorably to obtaining voice. In the experimental conditions in both countries, however, I expect the opposite effect to take place. In the Netherlands, I expect the experimental condition to show results similar to those found in the control condition in India (moderately unfavorable response to being denied voice, moderately favorable response to obtaining voice), whereas in the experimental condition in India, I expect results similar to those found in the control condition in the Netherlands (very unfavorable response to being denied voice, very favorable response to obtaining voice).

Study 1

This study was performed in the Netherlands and made use of inducing a countercultural power distance norm in the experimental condition to strengthen possible conclusions about cross-cultural differences between both countries being observed in this research.

Method

Participants and design. One hundred and thirty-one Dutch students (100 women; Mean age = 20.02 years, SD = 3.20) from the Utrecht University participated in the study. During a lecture, students were asked if they wanted to participate in the study. They were told that the

concepts measured and manipulated in the experiment would later be taught in the course. Participants were randomly designated to one of the conditions of the 2 (power distance: high vs. control) x 2 (procedure: voice vs. no voice) independent groups factorial design.

Experimental procedure. Participants were given a questionnaire, consisting of 4 parts (all in English), that took approximately fifteen minutes to complete.

In part one of the study, power distance was manipulated by posing two open-ended questions relating to perceived power distance. These questions were preceded by condition-specific instructions. This manipulation method was modeled after the manipulation often used in studies on behavioral disinhibition (e.g., Van den Bos, Müller & Van Bussel, 2009), the effect of status on procedural justice (Van Prooijen, Van den Bos & Wilke, 2002), and terror management studies (e.g., Van den Bos & Miedema, 2000). For example, in the latter study, mortality salience is induced by asking participants to answer two open-ended questions concerning the thoughts and feelings they have when they think about their death and the physical act of dying. Seeing as asking participants to think about the concept of dying is an effective method to induce mortality salience, an adapted form of this manipulation was used in the current study. Rather than ask people about their thoughts and feelings concerning their death, participants were asked to answer two open-ended questions concerning a high or low power distance, based on the definition of power distance by Hofstede (2001). More specifically, in the condition in which a high power distance between oneself and superiors was made salient (the high power distance condition) participants got the following instructions (for the low power distance condition, see Appendix A):

This part of the study will focus on other people's potential to determine or direct your behavior. More specifically, we ask you to read some materials and answer some questions that ask you to imagine that you are the less powerful and are willing to accept that those who have power over you (e.g., employers, politicians, police officers, etc.) have this because of their formal, hierarchical position.

Question 1 - Please describe a situation out of your own life in which there was a large distance between you and the person who formally had power over you. Thus, we ask you to imagine and describe to us a situation in which you were willing to accept that a person had power over you because of the person's formal, hierarchical position. Could you briefly describe this situation to us?

Question 2 - Imagine there is a large distance between you and a person who has power over you, thus that you are willing to accept that a person who formally has power over you because of the person's formal, hierarchical position. Could you briefly describe how you would feel in such a

situation and why it may be a good thing when a person with power occupies this powerful position by means of a formal, hierarchical appointment.

In the control condition, no power distance was made salient. Participants in the control condition got the following instructions:

In this part of the study we will ask you to read some materials and answer some questions concerning watching television. We ask you that you carefully read them and complete them.

Question 1 - Please describe briefly the thoughts and emotions that come to mind when you think of the concept watching TV.

Question 2 - Please describe a situation out of your own life in which watching TV played a role.

In the second part of the study, participants completed the twenty questions of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). This was done to check whether the power distance manipulation has an effect on participants' affective reactions. The PANAS also served as a filler task.

In the third part of the study the procedure was manipulated. This was done by having all participants read the same story about a reorganisation in a fictional company, after which they were given either voice or no voice in the decision making process concerning the reorganisation. The story was taken from Study 1 by Brockner et al. (2001):

Imagine that you are working in a company that has just undergone major changes. It is now using more advanced technology to manufacture and sell different products in new areas. As a result, your department also changed dramatically. It is smaller now, with fewer employees and managers. There are new reporting structures quite different from what you have been used to. Your own work has been influenced directly. What you do each day is very different from what you used to do and in fact continues to change as the company moves forward. Some employees are excited about the changes being made. Others are not as satisfied. Overall, it is still too early to tell whether these changes will ultimately place the company in a better position than it was before the changes started. As a result of the changes you have a new manager in your department.

In the voice condition, the story was concluded with the following text:

As decisions about the changes are now being made, this new manager is happy to consult with you and others about what changes are being considered and whether you think they are good ideas. This

manager also holds a weekly meeting in which you and your colleagues can suggest any ideas you and your colleagues thought of in the past week.

After listening to your ideas and considering other opinions, this manager makes the final decision.

In contrast, in the no voice condition the story was concluded with this text:

As decisions about the changes are now being made, this new manager does not consult with you or others about what changes are being considered and whether you think they are good ideas.

Attempts to consult with this manager about what changes are being considered are ignored.

This manager makes the decisions by himself and then announces them to you.

After the manipulation, the participants had to answer twenty questions on a 7-point scale, ranging from '1 = *not at all*' to '7 = *very much*'. The first two questions regarded the amount of voice the participants experienced and were considered manipulation checks ("the new manager in this situation attempts to involve me in decisions that affect me", "my views are taken into account by the manager"). The other eighteen questions measured participants' ratings of positive and negative affect toward the way they were treated (e.g. "how disappointed do you feel about the way you were treated?", "how happy do you feel about the way you were treated?") and toward the management (e.g. "how satisfied are you with the managing style of the management?").

In the last part of the study, participants answered seven questions on a 7-point scale, ranging from '1 = *not at all*' to '7 = *very much*'. The questions checked whether the power distance manipulation in the first part of the study was successful by simply measuring the level of power distance. The questions were taken from two power distance scales used to measure the level of power distance (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Kirkman, Chen, Farh & Chen, 2008). The questionnaire was concluded with a couple of questions concerning demographics.

Results

High power vs control. To test whether the procedure effect was greater in the control condition than in the high power condition, a 2 (power distance: high vs control) x 2 (procedure: voice vs no voice) factorial manova was performed on participants' ratings of positive and negative affect toward the way they were treated. This yielded a significant main

effect for procedure, $F(20, 108) = 34.51, p < .001, \eta^2 = .86$. The interaction between power distance and procedure was nonsignificant, $F(20, 108) = .938, ns$.

When observing the univariate F-tests on all variables concerning the interaction effect, four variables showed a significance of F under .200 (variable 5, 6, 12 and 13). All four variables concern feelings of disappointment (or the opposite), and when the variables were recoded and compiled into a new scale (coded *disappointment*), the items showed to be internally consistent (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$). When the same 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial manova was performed on the new *disappointment* scale, I again get a significant main effect for procedure, $F(1, 127) = 152.04, p < .001, \eta^2 = .54$, however the interaction between power distance and procedure was not quite significant, $F(1, 127) = 3.65, p < .06$.

After checking the data for influential data using a method explained by Cook (1977), I found that two observations show a relatively high Cook value when compared to the rest (Cook value $> .04$). When these two observations were excluded from the 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial manova, I found a significant main effect for procedure, $F(1, 125) = 152.29, p < .001, \eta^2 = .55$, and a significant interaction effect between power distance and procedure, $F(1,125) = 6.07, p < .02, \eta^2 = .05$, such that participants in the control condition showed a stronger procedure effect, $F(1, 125) = 114.30, p < .001, \eta^2 = .48$, than participants in the high power distance condition, $F(1, 125) = 46.97, p < .001, \eta^2 = .27$ (see Table 1).

Discussion

As predicted, participants responded more negatively to getting no voice than when getting voice, regardless of power distance (Table 1). However, participants in the control condition showed a stronger effect of procedure than participants in the high power distance condition. This suggests that people in a low power distance context, like in the Netherlands, respond more negatively to receiving no voice (and more positively to receiving voice) than people in a high power distance context. This both replicates Brockner et al.'s (2001) findings and verifies my predictions. Table 1 shows the means and SD's of the *disappointment* scale for each of the four conditions.

Table 1. Mean scores on the *disappointment* scale (standard deviations are in parentheses)

Level of voice	Power distance	
	High power	Control
Voice	4.11 (1.35)	3.47 (0.97)
No voice	5.74 (0.72)	5.92 (0.53)

Study 2

This study is similar to Study 1 in design and was performed in India. In line with Study 1, this study also made use of inducing a countercultural power distance norm in the experimental condition to strengthen possible conclusions about cross-cultural differences between both countries being observed in this research.

Method

Participants and design. One hundred and twenty-two Indian students (58 women; Mean age = 23.25 years, SD = 1.65) from the Karnatak University participated in the study. Participants were randomly designated to one of the conditions of the 2 (power distance: low vs. control) x 2 (procedure: voice vs. no voice) independent groups factorial design.

Experimental procedure. The experimental procedure for this study was identical to the procedure used in Study 1, with the exception of the experimental design being slightly different (low power vs. control instead of high power vs. control). Also, *caste* was added as a demographic variable at the end of the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

Results

Low power vs. control. In this study, to test whether the procedure-effect is greater in the low power distance condition than in the control condition, I performed a 2 (power distance: high vs control) x 2 (procedure: voice vs. no voice) factorial manova on participants' ratings of positive and negative affect toward the way they were treated. This yielded a significant main effect for procedure, $F(20, 99) = 4.73, p < .001, \eta^2 = .49$. The interaction between power distance and procedure was also significant, $F(20, 99) = 1.76, p < .04, \eta^2 = .26$, indicating that the effect of the procedure is different for both power conditions (see Table 2).

Table 2: Mean scores of the main effect (standard deviations are in parentheses)

Level of voice	Power distance	
	Low power	Control
Voice	5.300 (1.489)	2.618 (1.792)
No voice	5.212 (1.431)	4.200 (1.581)

Subscales positive affect regarding treatment and justice. The questionnaire following the procedural manipulation contained eighteen questions regarding participants' ratings of positive and negative affect toward the way they were treated. To see whether relevant subscales could be drawn from these questions, I created two subscales, *positive affect* and *justice*, each containing several items pertaining to the concept of the subscale. The subscale *positive affect*, containing seven items, has a Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$, whereas the subscale *justice*, containing four items, has a Cronbach's $\alpha = .92$.

Positive affect. When I performed a 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial manova on the *positive affect* subscale, I found a significant main effect for procedure, $F(1, 118) = 52.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .31$, showing that participants generally respond more positively to getting voice than getting no voice (see Table 3). I also found a significant interaction effect between power distance and procedure, $F(1, 118) = 7.38$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$. To interpret this last result, I looked at both the differences 1) between the power distance conditions on the procedure and 2) between the procedure conditions and the power distance.

Performing a 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial manova on the first of these interactions yields a significant effect for the procedure within the low power condition, $F(1, 118) = 52.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .31$, as well as a significant effect for the procedure within the control condition, $F(1, 118) = 9.71$, $p < .003$, $\eta^2 = .08$. As predicted, the procedure effect is much stronger in the low power distance condition than in the control condition.

Performing a 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial manova on the second of these interactions yields only a significant effect for power distance within the no voice condition, $F(1, 118) = 6.38$, $p < .015$, $\eta^2 = .05$, suggesting that the effect of power distance on procedure is greatest in the no voice condition (as predicted by Brockner et al., 2001).

Table 3: Mean scores on the *positive affect* scale (standard deviations are in parentheses)

Level of voice	Power distance	
	Low power	Control
Voice	5.519 (0.990)	4.823 (1.205)
No voice	3.172 (1.474)	3.760 (1.465)

Justice. When I performed a 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial manova on the *justice* subscale, I found a significant main effect for procedure, $F(1, 118) = 49.87, p < .001, \eta^2 = .30$, again showing that participants generally respond more positively to getting voice than getting no voice (see Table 4). I also found a significant interaction effect between power distance and procedure, $F(1, 118) = 10.42, p < .003, \eta^2 = .08$. To interpret this result, I again looked at both the differences 1) between the power distance conditions on the procedure and 2) between the procedure conditions and the power distance.

Performing a 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial manova on the first of these interactions yields a significant effect for the procedure within the low power condition, $F(1, 118) = 57.27, p < .001, \eta^2 = .33$, as well as a significant effect of the procedure manipulation within the control condition, $F(1, 118) = 7.93, p < .007, \eta^2 = .06$. As was predicted, the procedure effect is much stronger in the low power distance condition than in the control condition.

Performing a 2 (power distance) x 2 (procedure) factorial MANOVA on the second of these interactions yields only a significant effect for power distance within the no voice condition, $F(1, 118) = 15.53, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$, again suggesting that the effect of power distance on procedure is greatest in the no voice condition (as predicted by Brockner et al., 2001).

Table 4: Mean scores on the *justice* scale (standard deviations are in parentheses)

Level of voice	Power distance	
	Low power	Control
Voice	5.433 (1.198)	4.962 (1.225)
No voice	2.904 (1.566)	4.020 (1.350)

Discussion

As predicted, participants responded more positively to getting voice than getting no voice, regardless of power distance. However, participants in the low power distance condition showed a stronger effect of procedure than participants in the control condition. This suggests that people in a low power distance context respond more negatively to receiving no voice (and more positively to receiving voice) than people in a high power distance context. This is in line with my predictions. This effect could be seen in both the *positive affect* subscale and the *justice* subscale.

General discussion

Both studies have shown that people in a low power distance context respond more positively to obtaining voice and more negatively to not obtaining voice than people in a high power distance context.

Study 1 showed there was a significant difference between the high power distance condition and the control condition in the Netherlands in the affective response to obtaining (or being denied) voice. This is in line with the prediction (and in line with Hofstede, 2001) that the Netherlands is a predominantly low power distance culture. Since no power distance was manipulated in the control condition, I expected participants to default back to their culture-specific power distance, in this case being a low power distance. The results are also in line with Brockner et al., (2001), who showed that people from a low power distance culture (e.g. the United States) respond less favorably to being denied voice than people from a high power distance culture (e.g. the People's Republic of China).

Study 2 showed the exact same effect as in Study 1, however in this study the predominant power distance culture of the participants was a high power distance (India; see Hofstede, 2001). In this study, two separate subscales showed a significant difference in people's affective reaction to obtaining (or being denied) voice between the low power distance condition and the control condition. Again I expected participants in the control condition to default back to their culture-specific power distance, in this case being a high power distance. The results showed that participants in the low power distance condition responded more negatively when denied voice than participants in the control condition. This is again in line with my predictions.

One question that arises from these studies concerns the comparability of these results: to what degree can we compare the data from Study 1 to the data from Study 2? Although it is

difficult to answer this question, we can start by looking whether there is a significant difference between the control condition from Study 1 and the control condition from Study 2. In both cases we expect the participants to default back to their culture-specific power distance, in Study 1 being a low power distance and in Study 2 being a high power distance. If there is indeed a difference in cultural power distance, we would expect to find a significant difference between these two groups. This is indeed what I found, $F(1, 102) = 3.56, p < .001, \eta^2 = .41$. Also, subsequent analyses show that both groups differ significantly in the effect of procedure on affect, with the Netherlands having a stronger effect of procedure on affect than India ($\eta^2 = .71$ and $.49$, respectively).

The assumption that this difference constitutes a genuine difference between both cultures is strengthened by the fact that a countercultural norm was made salient in the experimental condition in both studies, which proved to differ significantly from the control condition in these studies where nothing was made salient. In other words, both the experimental condition from Study 1 and the control condition from Study 2 differ significantly from the control condition in the Netherlands (Study 1). In the same way, both the experimental condition from Study 2 and the control condition from Study 1 differ significantly from the control condition in India (Study 2). This strongly suggests that the difference in the affective reaction to obtaining or being denied voice between the control conditions in both countries can be attributed to a genuine cultural difference in power distance between the Netherlands and India.

Additional findings

Manipulating cultural power distance. Although the studies described above showed only a control condition and an experimental condition where a countercultural norm was made salient, I also included an experimental condition wherein the cultural norm was made salient (i.e. high power distance in India, low power distance in the Netherlands). When trying to induce a high power distance context in Indian participants, I obtained unexpected results. India is by default a high power distance culture, so one would expect that trying to induce a high power distance context would show results similar to those from the control condition. This was not the case however, since the interaction effect between the control condition and the high power condition was significant, $F(1, 106) = 1.83, p < .03, \eta^2 = .26$, meaning that there is a significant difference between the high power distance condition and the control condition.

Even though this interaction was not predicted, it can still be explained. It is possible that making a culture-specific context salient changes the effect it has on one's behavior, much like telling someone who is walking how to walk. Focusing one's attention on behavior that is normally fluent and automatic can make it awkward and stiff. It is interesting to note that the same problem did not occur in the Netherlands. In other words, there was no significant interaction effect between the low power distance condition and the control condition, $F(1, 107) = 1.06, ns$. Subsequent research should point out whether the interaction within the India dataset is simply an anomaly or the norm.

Subscales. Both from the Netherlands dataset and India dataset, subscales were derived from the affective measurements following the voice manipulation. From the Netherlands dataset, the subscale *disappointment* was derived, containing four items concerning disappointment (or excitement, rescaled) with the way one was treated. From the India dataset, two subscales were derived: *positive affect* (seven items) and *justice* (four items).

It is interesting to see that the subscale derived from the Netherlands dataset is different from the subscales that are derived from the India dataset. It is possible that different concepts play a role in each of these two cultures when they consider dilemmas like the one posed in the current research. For instance, it is possible that people from the Netherlands focus more on the negative consequences for oneself (e.g. disappointment), while people from India focus more on the social consequences and the justness in general (e.g. justice). More research is needed to see if this is indeed the cause of this difference. Nonetheless, these scales can be used in future research to measure people's affective reaction toward being given (or being denied) voice.

Improvements for future research

A couple of problems occurred during the process of performing this research. These problems, along with suggested improvements, will be touched upon briefly in this section.

Second data set from the Netherlands. Before obtaining the data from the Netherlands as it is used in the current research, another data set was gathered from the student population from the Utrecht University. In contrast to the dataset used in this study, the first dataset was obtained over a timespan of more than two weeks. Subsequent analyses showed that the data did not fit our predictions. To check whether this was due to the timespan in which the data was gathered, the second data set was gathered within one day. As can be seen in the results

section of study 1, this data set did match our predictions. Subsequent research into this subject should compensate for this, since it is possible that the effect measured in this study is very sensitive to temporal variability.

Convenience sample. Both in the Netherlands and in India data was mainly obtained among students. Since young students are not an accurate representation of the population at large, future research could focus on more representative samples. Also, the convenience sampling prevented us from meaningfully correcting for variables like age and years of education, since these variables did not vary much among participants.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of the two studies suggest there is a significant difference in power distance between the Netherlands and India. Besides passively observing this difference, I also introduced an experimental condition that induced a countercultural norm, this procedure being pioneered by Van den Bos et al. (2010). This enabled me to draw a more definitive conclusion about the nature of the observed difference of the reactions of participants within both countries on the measure of procedural justice. I hope that future research into cross-cultural differences will make more use of this new procedure to strengthen any conclusions that will be drawn from them.

References

- Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M. J., Francesco, A. M., Chen, Z. X., Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gomez, C., Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. (2001). Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, p. 300-315.
- Cook, R. D. (1977). Detection of influential observations in linear regression. *Technometrics, 19*, p. 15-18.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organisations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J.-L., Chen, Z., & Lowe, K. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 52* (4), p. 744-764.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organisational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal, 44* (3), p. 557-569.
- Van Prooijen, J.-W., Van den Bos, K., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2002). Procedural justice and status: Status salience as antecedent of the fair process effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, p. 1353-1361.
- Van den Bos, K., Brockner, J., Stein, J. H., Steiner, D. D., Van Yperen, N. W., & Dekker, D. M. (2010). The psychology of voice and performance capabilities in masculine and feminine cultures and contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99* (4), p. 638-648.
- Van den Bos, K., & Miedema, J. (2000). Toward understanding why fairness matters: The influence of mortality salience on reactions to procedural fairness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79* (3), p. 355-366.

Van den Bos, K., Müller, P. A., & Van Bussel, A. A. L. (2009). Helping to overcome intervention inertia in bystander's dilemmas: Behavioral disinhibition can improve the greater good. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, p. 873-878.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, p. 1063-1070.

Appendix A

Low power distance condition

This part of the study will focus on other people's potential to determine or direct your behavior. More specifically, we ask you to read some materials and answer some questions that ask you to imagine that you and those who have power over you (e.g., employers, teachers, your parents, etc.) regard each other as equals. Thus, formal positions do not matter so much.

Question 1 - Please describe a situation out of your own life in which there was a small distance between you and the person who formally had power over you. Thus, we ask you to imagine and describe to us a situation in which you and a person who formally had power over you regarded each other more or less as equals. Could you briefly describe this situation to us?

Question 2 - Imagine there is a small distance between you and a person who has power over you, thus that you and a person who formally has power over you regard each other more or less as equals. Could you briefly describe how you would feel in such a situation and why it may be a good thing when a person with power treats you as being equal.

Appendix B

Example questionnaire of the low power distance, no voice condition in India

Thank you for participating in this research!

The research questionnaire consists of several parts, and it will take about 15 minutes to complete the total questionnaire. We ask you to fill in the questionnaire by yourself, if possible without distractions.

Your answers will be processed anonymously. Good luck!

Part 2

In this part of the study you will see a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each of these words and circle the appropriate box. Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment.

Right now, at the present moment, I feel:

1.	Interested	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
2.	Distressed	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
3.	Excited	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
4.	Upset	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
5.	Strong	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
6.	Guilty	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
7.	Scared	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
8.	Hostile	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
9.	Enthusiastic	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
10.	Proud	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
11.	Irritable	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
12.	Alert	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
13.	Ashamed	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
14.	Inspired	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
15.	Nervous	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
16.	Determined	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
17.	Attentive	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
18.	Jittery	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
19.	Active	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely
20.	Afraid	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely

Part 3

In this part of the study you will find a short story which describes a hypothetical situation. We ask you to carefully read the story, after which you answer a couple of questions concerning the story.

Imagine that you are working in a company that has just undergone major changes. It is now using more advanced technology to manufacture and sell different products in new areas. As a result, your department also changed dramatically. It is smaller now, with fewer employees and managers. There are new reporting structures quite different from what you have been used to. Your own work has been influenced directly. What you do each day is very different from what you used to do and in fact continues to change as the company moves forward. Some employees are excited about the changes being made. Others are not as satisfied. Overall, it is still too early to tell whether these changes will ultimately place the company in a better position than it was before the changes started. As a result of the changes you have a new manager in your department.

As decisions about the changes are now being made, this new manager does not consult with you or others about what changes are being considered and whether you think they are good ideas. Attempts to consult with this manager about what changes are being considered are ignored.

This manager makes the decisions by himself and then announces them to you.

Please answer the following questions concerning the story you just read.

1. The new manager in this situation attempts to involve me in decisions that affect me

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

2. My views are taken into account by the manager

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

3. How angry do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

4. How hostile do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

5. How disappointed do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

6. How discouraged do you feel due to the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

7. How insecure do you feel due to the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

8. How unimportant do you feel due to the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

9. How happy do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

10. How satisfied do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

11. How pleased do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

12. How excited do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

13. How enthusiastic do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

14. How elevated do you feel about the way you were treated?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

15. How satisfied are you with the managing style of the manager?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

16. How fair do you think the managing style of the manager is?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

17. How just do you think the managing style of the manager is?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

18. How satisfied are you with the managing style of the management?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

19. How fair do you think the managing style of the management is?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

20. How just do you think the managing style of the management is?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *very much*

Part 4

In this part of the study we will ask you to answer some final questions. This part of the study should take approximately 3 minutes.

Please indicate how much each of the following statements apply to you right now.

1. People at higher levels in organizations have a responsibility to make important decisions for people below them

<i>not at all</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>very much</i>
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

2. Employees who often question authority sometimes keep their managers from being effective

<i>not at all</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>very much</i>
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

3. People at lower levels in organizations should carry out the requests of people at higher levels without question

<i>not at all</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>very much</i>
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

4. People at lower levels in the organization should not have much power in organizations

<i>not at all</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>very much</i>
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

5. In work-related matters, managers have a right to expect obedience from their subordinates

<i>not at all</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>very much</i>
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

6. Employees should not express disagreements with their managers

<i>not at all</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>very much</i>
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

7. A company's rules should not be broken – not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest

<i>not at all</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>very much</i>
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

Gender (circle what applies):

male/female

How old are you?

..... years

How many years of formal school education did you complete? (this includes primary school and middle school)

..... years

Do you have any religious affiliation? (tick what applies)

I am

- a Christian
- a Muslim
- Jewish
- a Hindu
- a Jain
- a Sikh
- a Buddhist
- something else, namely:
- not religious

What caste do you belong to? (tick what applies)

- GM
- SC/ST
- OBC
- other, namely:
- I do not belong to a caste

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation!

Stageverslag

Naam: Michael van den Oudenalder

Studentnummer: 3019896

(interne stage) begeleider: prof. dr. Kees van den Bos

Voor het kiezen van een interne stagebegeleider heb ik mijzelf eerst ingelezen in de onderwerpen die de verschillende begeleiders aanboden. Na een kleine selectie gemaakt te hebben ging ik bij elk van deze docenten langs om wat vragen te stellen over de precieze inhoud van hun stageplek en hoeveel ruimte er was om zelf met input te komen. Bij Kees kreeg ik het gevoel dat er veel mogelijk was en dat is ook uiteindelijk de reden geweest dat ik Kees als begeleider heb gekozen.

Aan het begin van de stage gaf Kees mij veel artikelen mee om te lezen. Hij bood een aantal verschillende onderzoeksonderwerpen aan in zijn programma, dus het was zaak om eerst uit te zoeken welke richting ik op wilde gaan. In eerste instantie neigde ik naar een onderzoek over moraliteit en normen en waarden. We konden hier leuke, diepgaande discussies over hebben, dus het leek mij een goed idee om hier op door te gaan. In de praktijk bleek het echter vrij lastig om onderzoek te doen in deze richting, mede doordat mijn insteek op een fundamenteeler niveau zou plaatsvinden dan praktisch haalbaar.

Na nog wat meer gelezen te hebben over de verschillende onderwerpen die Kees onderzoekt kwam ik langs een onderzoek over een cultureel verschil tussen Amerika en India. Uit dit onderzoek kwam naar voren dat mensen uit India eerder een onbekend persoon zouden helpen dan mensen uit Amerika. Sterker nog, ze zien dit ook als hun morele plicht! Dit verbaasde me enorm. Hoe kan het dat mensen uit het ene land het helpen van vreemden zien als een morele plicht, terwijl mensen uit het andere land met moeite hun eigen vrienden en familie uit de brand helpen? Om kort te zijn: mijn interesse voor cross-cultureel onderzoek was gewekt.

Na vele gesprekken en vele artikelen gelezen te hebben kwamen we op het onderwerp van de huidige thesis: culturele verschillen in power distance tussen Nederland en India, gemeten op verschillen in reacties op het verkrijgen van voice. We hebben gekozen voor India omdat Kees al contact had met een onderzoeker uit India, genaamd Shanmukh Kamble, die dolgraag onderzoek met hem wilde doen. Het leek Kees de perfecte manier om deze twee projecten te combineren.

Na het uitwerken van de onderzoeksopzet was het tijd om data te verzamelen. Na wat tips over het afnemen van vragenlijsten op de Uithof in te hebben gewonnen van een onderzoekster aan de UU was het tijd om daadwerkelijk proefpersonen te werven. Dit was wat mij betreft het lastigste deel van de stage. Ik had nog nooit vragenlijsten op deze manier afgenomen en ik vond het op de een of andere manier ook bezwaarlijk om mensen lastig te vallen met mijn vragenlijst.

Na een aantal weken had ik eindelijk genoeg participanten geworven om het te kunnen analyseren. Er was alleen één probleem: een deel van onze voorspellingen kwamen niet uit. Om te controleren of dit kwam doordat het verzamelen van de data zo lang heeft geduurd heeft Kees mij geholpen door toe te staan tijdens een van zijn eerstejaarscolleges (in de pauze) de vragenlijsten af te nemen. Gelukkig zag deze data er een stuk beter uit! Tegelijkertijd met mijn dataverzameling was Shanmukh bezig met zijn dataverzameling. Nadat ook daar enige vertraging was voorgekomen met het verzamelen van de data kwam ook uit India de data die ik nodig had voor mijn studie.

Kees heeft me enorm geholpen met de analyse door de belangrijkste analyses in syntax naar mij door te sturen. Na wat gesprekken met hem over de betekenis van de analyses kon ik aan de slag met het verwerken van de resultaten in deze thesis. Omdat ik haast nooit vanuit de studie gebruik maak van SPSS was het begrijpen van de data nog wel even lastig, maar uiteindelijk kreeg ik het weer onder de knie en heb ik zelf ook nog wat suggesties kunnen doen voor de analyses.

Ten slotte heb ik mij gericht op het verwerken van de data en theorie in de thesis. Ook dit was een enorme klus, maar ook hier heeft Kees mij geholpen door mij tips te geven over hoe ik het beste orde kan scheppen in de zee van informatie. Alhoewel het op het laatst qua tijd een beetje krap leek te worden heb ik alles uiteindelijk toch afgerond op de manier dat ik het zelf graag zie.

Geleerde lessen

Als ik kort zou moeten beschrijven wat ik in de stage heb geleerd zijn het twee dingen. Ten eerste heb ik geleerd hoe ik vragenlijsten *on the spot* moet afnemen. Ik had nog nooit met een pakket vragenlijsten rondgelopen met de intentie die door willekeurige mensen in te laten vullen, maar uiteindelijk wende het wel. Je leert mensen overtuigen jou te helpen met je onderzoek en je krijgt ook feedback van mensen die denken een foutje in je vragenlijst gevonden te hebben. Dit was allemaal heel leerzaam. Ten tweede heb ik ook geleerd hoe ik data, in een design zoals die in dit onderzoek van toepassing was, het beste kan analyseren.

Alhoewel de tijd te kort was om echt álles uit de data te halen denk ik toch dat ik een beter inzicht heb gekregen in de manier waarop dit soort datasets het beste en meest overzichtelijk te analyseren zijn. Ook het gebruik van de syntax in SPSS is iets wat ik in toekomstig onderzoek ook zeker zal gebruiken.