RUNNING HEAD: CULTURE AND WORK

Culture and Work

Benjamin R. Levine[†] and Jesse R. Harrington[†]

University of Maryland, College Park

Eric Luis Uhlmann[†]

INSEAD

[†] The three authors contributed equally

CONTACT INFORMATION

Benjamin R. Levine

Department of Psychology

1147 Biology-Psychology Building

University of Maryland

College Park, MD 20742

Email: brlevine@umd.edu

Jesse R. Harrington

Department of Psychology

1147 Biology-Psychology Building

University of Maryland

College Park, MD 20742

Email: jesserh@umd.edu

Eric Luis Uhlmann

INSEAD, Organisational Behaviour Area

1 Ayer Rajah Avenue

138676 Singapore

Email: eric.luis.uhlmann@gmail.com

Abstract

The focus of the present chapter is on cross-cultural differences in work habits and values, as well as how they are studied. We review national differences in hours worked and work productivity, cross-national surveys on broad dimensions of culture (e.g., power distance, individualism, tightness, survival values) and their relationships to work-related outcomes, as well as social class as a dimension of work culture. Also considered are the unique contributions of experimental approaches to the cultural psychology of work and their utility in probing specific cultural workways, such as guanxi, simpatía, and Protestant relational ideology. Finally, we discuss future directions for research on culture and work.

With the continued rise of the globalized economy, workplaces are increasingly diverse, multicultural environments (Javidan, Dorfman, De Luque, & House, 2006). Although this presents many new opportunities for businesses and workers, it also presents challenges, most notably understanding, managing, and leveraging cultural differences. Cultures vary in many aspects, but the focus of the current chapter is cultural differences in work habits and values. Bringing together employees from various cultural backgrounds does provide some unique benefits (Chiu & Hong, CHAPTER, this volume; Leung & Koh, CHAPTER, this volume). However, the complications arising from the multicultural nature of global work often results in team and even organizational conflicts. In addition, these multicultural differences also increasingly lead to the failure of expatriate assignments (Morris, Fowler, & Savani, CHAPTER, this volume). The focus of this chapter is to review empirical studies of some of those key differences, discuss the various ways in which cultural differences in work norms and values are evaluated and studied, and also to discuss future directions for examining those differences through scientific research.

Researchers have employed a multitude of quantitative approaches to study and better understand cultural differences in work-related values and behaviors. These methodologies include cross-national studies of objective indicators (e.g., hours worked per year), cross-national surveys (e.g., self-reported work values), experimental manipulations (e.g., subtly activating a culture's work values using situational cues), and multi-method studies of the workways of specific cultures (e.g., Protestant Relational Ideology in the United States).

Work Hours and Productivity Across Nations

Work is an important part of how people spend their lives across the globe. In addition to the fact that work often comprises a significant percentage of an individual's waking hours on a near daily basis, work is often deeply incorporated into people's identities. At the same time, there is a large amount of cross-national variability in the amount of time that people work. According to The Conference Board (2016), a non-profit business membership and research group organization, Cambodia, Bangladesh, and Vietnam had the highest working hours in 2016 with an average of 2,565.01, 2371.81, and 2,339.95 annual hours per worker, respectively. This translates into approximately 46 hours per week, if divided by 52 weeks. By contrast, the European nations of Norway, Germany, and the Netherlands had the lowest with an average of 1,423.93, 1,376.41, and 1,423.02 annual hours per worker, or a weekly approximate average of 27 hours per week.

These national differences in work time are tied closely to productivity. Norway, Germany, and the Netherlands are some of the most productive economies in the world in terms of the adjusted dollar amount produced per work hour, while Cambodia, Bangladesh, and Vietnam are some of the least productive (The Conference Board, 2016). These examples are demonstrative of a greater general trend. Specifically, there is a substantial negative correlation between hours worked and productivity at the international level, such that lower productivity tends to be related to greater work hours and vice versa (Our World in Data, 2016). Differences in cross-national productivity, and consequently cross-national work hours, are likely due in part to the broader differences found between the economically developed and developing world. The former often has the latest and most efficient technologies, a highly educated workforce, a strong

financial sector to provide capital, and institutions and social infrastructure that encourage

productive activities, the accumulation of capital, and a commitment to supporting research and

development (Hall & Jones, 1999). Indeed, the low work time and high productivity side of this

trend is dominated by the more developed and wealthier Western nations. By contrast, the high

work time and lower productivity sector is primarily the domain of many poorer and less

economically developed nations from South America, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and the

West Indies. Of course, interpreting the cross-national correlation between work hours and

productivity is not entirely straightforward, since different types of work often predominate in

these different countries.

　　　Notably, cross-cultural differences in work hours are not only found between modern

societies, but also when comparing modern, agrarian-based societies with pre-modern, hunter-

gatherer societies. As demonstrated by anthropologists, labor inputs for the purposes of

subsistence in the latter are often fairly small. Indeed, for premodern societies hours worked per

day range from 2.8 hours among the Yanomamo to 7.8 hours among the Tatuyo Amazonian

tribes, with an average of about 5.3 hours per day across many pre-modern groups (Clark, 2008).

By contrast, the average working time was approximately 8.8 hours per day in the United

Kingdom for the year 2000 (Clark, 2008) and 8.9 in the United States for the year 2014 (Bureau

of Labor Statistics, 2014).

　　　The negative relationship between work time and productivity found at the international

level also holds at the individual level (Cette, Chang, & Konte, 2011; Pencavel, 2014; Shepard &

Clifton, 2000), though for reasons that are based in the limitations of the human animal rather

than socio-economic structures. Indeed, this research has found that productivity per work hour

has an upper limit at which point marginal productivity begins to decrease. Using data from British munitions workers during the First World War, Pencavel (2014) found this to occur around about 50 hours of work per week. The realities of industrial munitions production, however, are very different than the work in many developed nations today. Indeed, more modern estimations using nations from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) appear to find this "fatigue effect" in productivity at lower average work times (Cette, Chang, & Konte, 2011).

In addition to these findings, research has found that longer work hours negatively correlate with both physical and mental health and overall well-being. In particular, longer work hours negatively relate to quantity of sleep (Virtanen, Ferrie, Gimeno, Vahtera, Elovainio, Singh-Manoux, et al., 2009) and cognitive function (Virtanen, Singh-Manoux, Ferrie, Gimeno, Marmot, Elovainio, et al., 2009), correlate with greater incidence of depressive episodes (Virtanen, Stansfeld, Fuhrer, Ferrie, & Kivimäki, 2012), an increase in coronary heart disease (Virtanen, Ferrie, Singh-Manoux, Shipley, Vahtera, Marmot, & Kivimäki, 2010; Virtanen, Heikkilä, Jokela, Ferrie, Batty, Vahtera, & Kivimäki, 2012), an increased risk of diabetes (Kivimäki, Virtanen, Kawachi, Nyberg, Alfredsson, Batty et al., 2015), and heavier use of alcohol (Virtanen, Jokela, Nyberg, Madsen, Lallukka, Ahola et al., 2015). The correlates of long work hours, as revealed by the variability in work hours across the globe, is suggestive of deleterious effects on human physical and mental health but whether this relationship is a causal one awaits further research.

Moreover, although the objective measures of work time and productivity are important and informative, there are also significant methodological limitations. In particular, work times

in some nations are systematically under-reported. In Japan, for example, workers are commonly expected to put in unpaid overtime, which is not accounted for in the two official national assessments of Japanese work hours: The Monthly Labor Survey (MLS) and the Labor Force Survey (LFS) (Mizunoya, 2002). Indeed, some evidence suggests that Japanese workers put in an average of 20 hours of unpaid overtime per month (Mizunoya, 2002). The overburden of work in Japan is enough of a problem that a term exists for people who die or commit suicide from overworking: *karoshi*. Cases of *karoshi* are not uncommon and appear to be on the rise (Reuters, 2016) and there even exists a national hotline for victims of this phenomenon (http://karoshi.jp/english/activities.html). Overall, Japan appears to have a work culture that facilitates this expectation of extra hours, which is considerably different from the work cultures of some Western European nations. Contrast norms regarding unpaid and unreported work hours in Japan with the push in France to limit the expectation for workers to answer emails and phone calls outside of work hours (BBC, 2016). This comparison gets to the core point of this chapter, which is that work is dramatically influenced by the norms and values of the cultural contexts that it inhabits. We turn to such cross-national and within-nation differences in values next.

Cross-Cultural Differences in Work Values

Scholars and researchers have increasingly recognized that cultural values influence motivations, behaviors, and perceptions associated with work. In the following, we discuss some well-known studies and frameworks that have identified broad dimensions of cultural values and their relationship with work. At the same time, we emphasize that some differences in cultural

values exist above and beyond national boundaries, and are captured by other distinctions such as social class divisions.

Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions

Hofstede (1980) defined culture as "...the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another." In the late 1960s and early 1970s, he developed his cultural value framework with data from 116,000 morale surveys completed by 88,000 IBM employees living in 72 countries and regions (reduced to 40 countries that had more than 50 responses each) and speaking twenty languages. Utilizing a country level factor analysis, Hofstede (1980) classified the represented countries along four dimensions.

Individualism-Collectivism:

The first dimension, *individualism-collectivism*, is defined as the degree to which people in a culture prefer situations where they identify and act as individuals versus the preference for situations where they identify and act as members of a representative ingroup (Hofstede, 1994). Individualism-collectivism is a cultural value dimension concerning the relation of an individual to the collectives in their society (Hofstede, 1980). Collectivism can be characterized by the subordination of personal goals for collective goals and extended family relationships, and individualism refers to the separation from ingroups and independence from others (Triandis, 1995). More simply, individualists tend to operate according to self-interest, whereas collectivists operate according to a group interest. There are many varieties of individualism-collectivism (Triandis, 2001). Horizontal-vertical is one frequently utilized distinguishing aspect of individualism-collectivism, which results in four distinct types of cultures (Shavitt, CHAPTER, this volume; Triandis, 2001). Specifically, 1) Horizontal Individualist, where people

want to be unique; 2) Vertical Individualist, where people want to do their own thing and also to be the best; 3) Horizontal Collectivism, where people merge their selves with their ingroups; and 4) Vertical Collectivism, where people are willing to sacrifice themselves for their ingroup and submit to the authority of the ingroup. In addition to the vertical-horizontal dimension, many other dimensions define different varieties of individualism and collectivism and different types of cultures (Triandis, 1995).

Researchers have also spent considerable time determining which regions of the world, and specific groups of individuals, are more individualistic or collectivistic than others (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Results from a meta-analysis indicate that compared to other regions of the world, Europeans and Americans were both more individualistic and less collectivistic than members of other cultures. However, Americans as a whole were indistinguishable on individualism-collectivism from other English-speaking countries.

Individualism-collectivism has become one of the most widely utilized constructs in cross-cultural psychology (Voronov & Singer, 2002), exemplified by diverse and wide-reaching research streams, where collectivists and individualists have been shown to differ in a variety of aspects (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002; Triandis, 2001). For example, researchers have utilized individualism-collectivism to explain cultural differences in communication styles, such that collectivists are more likely to speak indirectly than individualists (Holtgraves, 1997), and preferred leadership styles such that collectivists are more likely to prefer working in teams (House et al., 2004; Offerman & Hellman, 1997). Individualists and collectivists also differ in their preferred methods of conflict resolution (Leung, Au, Fernandez-Dols, & Iwawaki, 1992; Leung & Fan, 1997). More specifically, in conflict situations collectivists are primarily

concerned with maintaining their relationship with others, whereas individualists are primarily concerned with achieving justice (Ohbuchi, Fukushima, & Tedeschi, 1999). Thus, individualists are willing to forgo or even destroy relationships when settling disputes, whereas collectivists prefer methods of conflict resolution that maintain relationships (Leung, 1997).

Although initially established and widely examined using self-report surveys across nations, individualism-collectivism has also been subsequently investigated by manipulating the microenvironment of the research laboratory. Chatman and Barsade (1995) adapted an organizational simulation to examine interactions between individual and organizational values. Prior to the experiment, participants' collectivistic or individualistic predisposition was assessed based on their responses to a self-report assessment of cooperativeness. As "employees" in the organization, participants were given materials to read including the company's mission statement and a letter from the company's president. The company description highlighted the organization's reputation as an individualist or team organization, listed valued employee behaviors (cooperation or individual effort), and described how employees would characterize the organization (as team or individual oriented). An end-of-year awards celebration was also described that was either for work teams or individuals. During the laboratory simulation, participants performed job tasks in accordance with their roles and worked with other participants. The findings showed cooperative individuals were more responsive to the individualistic or collectivistic norms of their organization. In the collectivistic condition, the cooperative participants were rated as the most cooperative overall by their coworkers and had the strongest preferences for evaluating their work as a team rather than as individual achievements. Very interestingly, cooperative individuals were also more responsive to the

individualistic norms than were non-cooperative individuals. In other words, participants who scored high on trait cooperativeness behaved more individualistically when organizational values called for individualism.

Other work has selected participants from cultures known to be collectivistic or individualistic in orientation, and demonstrated that cultural background (e.g., nationality) moderates responses to laboratory situations. For instance, Leung and Bond (1984) conducted a laboratory experiment to determine the influence of cultural collectivism and individualism on reward allocation in public vs. private settings. The researchers predicted that in collectivistic cultures where social norms promote harmony and cohesion, people should be more likely to value equality. In contrast, in individualistic cultures that prioritize individual accomplishments and competition, people will emphasize merit over equality with regard to work compensation. Chinese and American participants were recruited to participate in a work task with a partner. Participants were given a word copying task and were informed that they would be compensated based upon the number of words they and their partner copied by the completion of the allotted time. The participants never met their partners but were told they were working on the same task in the next room. Each participant was asked to divide their pay at the end of the work task either equally between themselves and their partner or based on contribution, in which case they would personally receive twice as much money as their partner since they had ostensibly copied more words. Participants made the distribution decision either privately or publicly. In both the public and private condition, U.S. participants, from the more individualistic culture, chose pay based on contribution. The Chinese participants, from the more collectivist culture, chose to divide pay equally, but only in the public condition. In the private condition, Chinese participants chose to

allocate pay based on contribution. These findings suggest that a large piece of collectivism rests on reputational concerns.

Experimental studies further demonstrate that individualistic and collectivistic mindsets can be subtly activated and influence judgments and behaviors by affecting the accessibility of an associative network of constructs (Oyserman, 2017, CHAPTER, this volume). Goncalo and Staw (2006) utilized a construct activation procedure to investigate an overlooked benefit of individualistic values and potential downside of a team based, collectivist organizational culture. As organizations continue to become more team oriented, they tend to stress collectivist values which reduce social loafing and increase cooperation (Wagner, 1995) and increase identification with work groups (Chatman et al., 1998). However, Goncalo and Staw (2006) proposed that individualistic values, as opposed to collectivistic values, might better facilitate creativity. To examine the situational effect of individualism-collectivism on creativity, the researchers experimentally manipulated individualistic and collectivist orientations using a survey task, as well as specific instructions to be creative or practical in a subsequent task. For the survey task, participants were randomly assigned to either a) describe why it is beneficial to stand out from others (individualist prime) or b) describe the groups they belonged to and the similarities between themselves and others (collectivist prime). They were then told to come up with ideas for bringing a new business to a college campus. Half the participants were told that ideas should be practical; the other half were told ideas should be creative. Those told to be creative came up with the most creative ideas – but only when an individualistic mindset was also activated.

A highly effective and ecologically valid means of activating cultural mindsets is with language (Lee, Oyserman, & Bond, 2010). While some researchers believe the tendency to self enhance is strictly a Western phenomenon (Heine & Hamamura, 2007), others believe it to be universal (Sedikides, Gaertner, & Toguchi, 2003). Lee et al. (2010) contended that self-enhancement is instead related to specific cultural mindsets. The researchers predicted participants would be more self-enhancing when an individualistic mindset was made salient by using English than when a collectivistic mindset was made salient by using Chinese. Their participant pool consisted entirely of Chinese students. Across three studies, Chinese students self-enhanced, distanced themselves from outperforming others, and rated themselves better than others, but only when the study materials were presented in English as opposed to Chinese.

Power-Distance:

The second major cultural dimension identified by Hofstede (1980), *power distance*, is defined as the extent to which a society accepts hierarchical relationships, such that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally. In a high power distance culture, subordinates are not expected to express disagreement with their supervisors and supervisors are not expected to consult with their subordinates in the decision making process. Put another way, in low power distance cultures, individuals are accustomed to being treated as equals, and those in power are more likely to share their power with those in lower positions. In high power distance cultures, power is centralized with fewer individuals who do not share their influence. Cultures or individuals higher on power distance are more likely to value status, influence and prestige (Schwartz, 1999). Conversely, low power distance cultures and individuals value participative decision-making and consultative leadership (Hofstede, 1980).

Brockner and colleagues (2001) investigated the interactive effects of cultural differences in power distance and level of voice in decision-making processes on reactions to work related outcomes. The procedural justice literature indicates that people often react unfavorably when they have little voice in a decision-making process (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). The researchers conducted four studies investigating whether cultural background moderates this relationship. In Studies 1 and 2, using samples of research participants from the United States, China, and Mexico, participants read a hypothetical vignette informing participants that they were members of a company whose department had been rearranged. Participants also read information about their supervisor's decision-making style (the voice manipulation). The researchers manipulated voice by describing the manager's leadership style as either being open to input (high voice) or not open to input (low voice). Participants were asked how much commitment they would feel if they were working at the organization described. Voice was not manipulated in Study 3 or Study 4. In Study 3, participants' from Germany and Hong Kong were asked to describe a recent dispute they were involved in and rate the extent to which they had voice in the dispute. Study 4, using a sample of Chinese employees, asked participants to describe their relationship with their direct supervisor at work and rate the extent to which they had voice in the relationship. The findings revealed that participants responded with less organizational commitment to lower levels of voice in relatively low power distance cultures (U.S., Germany) but not in relatively high power distance cultures (China, Hong Kong, and Mexico).

Cultural differences in power distance are frequently taken into account in research on leadership. Theoretical explanations for the relationship between power distance and leader

influence have often diverged (Daniels & Greguras, 2014). Researchers have argued more generally that, as power distance increases, leaders hold more influence over their followers (i.e. Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007). However, leaders in high power distance cultures who deviate from the inherent distance characterizing typical leader–follower relations, are likely to wield diminished influence on employees (House et al., 2004). Transformational leadership (Bass, 1985), leadership characterized by charisma, motivation and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 2004), has received much of the attention in this area since the prototypical transformational leader theoretically acts antithetically towards the values – i.e. formality and centralized structures - of high power distance cultures. Indeed, research has found transformational leadership to be less effective in high power distance cultures (Kirkman et al., 2009).

Theoretical work also draws links between the expression of emotions and power distance. For instance, anger may be associated with social status (Tiedens, 2001) and power, but in a manner moderated by target gender (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008) and national culture. Park and colleagues (2013) found that higher social status in Japan was positively related to greater expression of anger relative to the United States, where the relationship was negative. Moreover, this relationship in Japan was mediated by decision-making authority. In Japanese culture then, the use of anger is viewed as a privilege of those higher in social power and as a way of asserting dominance. Notably, in contrast to the United States, anger expression in Japan is related to reduced biological health risks (Kitayama et al., 2015), possibly because it is a marker of social status in Japan rather than a marker of frustration as in the United States. More generally,

subordinates are more likely to suppress their emotions in high power distance cultures and organizations (Moran, Diefendorff, & Greguras, 2013).

Uncertainty Avoidance:

The third dimension, *uncertainty avoidance,* is the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and tries to avoid them by providing greater stability through the establishment of many clear and formal rules (Hofstede, 1980). It also can be characterized by little tolerance for deviant ideas and behaviors. Uncertainty avoidance is distinct from risk avoidance due to its focus on a society's' tolerance for ambiguity and unstructured situations (Hofstede, 2011). Unstructured situations are novel, unknown, and different from usual. Uncertainty avoiding cultures utilize strict behavioral codes, laws and rules in order to try to minimize the possibility of such situations. People in uncertainty avoiding countries tend to be more emotional, and motivated by inner nervous energy (Hofstede, 2011). Uncertainty accepting cultures have fewer rules and are more tolerant of different opinions. East and Central European countries, Latin Countries, German speaking countries and Japan tend to be more uncertainty avoidant cultures (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Moinkov, 2010). English speaking, Chinese and Nordic cultures tend to be higher in uncertainty acceptance.

Masculinity-Femininity:

The final of the original Hofstede dimensions is *masculinity-femininity*. Masculinity can be defined as the extent to which the dominant values in a society are stereotypically masculine—such as assertiveness and competitiveness—while femininity is the dominance of stereotypically feminine values, such as security and cooperation (Hofstede, 1980). It also refers to the distribution of values between genders in a society (Hofstede, 2011). Research in this area

has illustrated that men's values can vary greatly between cultures, from assertive to modest and caring, and women's values tend to be markedly more similar across cultures (Hofstede, 1998). In more feminine cultures, men and women share the more 'feminine' modest and caring traits. Contrastingly, in more masculine countries, there is a larger gap between the values of men and women. Additionally, in masculine cultures there is often a taboo around this dimension (Hofstede, 1998). Masculinity tends to be higher in Japan, German speaking countries and some Latin countries, and is moderately high in English speaking and Western Countries. It is low in Nordic Countries, Asian Countries and some Latin countries (Hofstede et al., 2010).

State of Research:

Research on cultural values, especially work by Hofstede (1980, 1994), pushed cross-cultural research forwards where geography was previously used as a proxy for culture (Gelfand et al., 2006). However, researchers have also concluded that there has been an overreliance on individualism-collectivism compared to Hofstede's other value dimensions (Gelfand et al., 2006; Tsui et al., 2007). Taras and colleagues (2010) also reviewed the state of work conducted on Hofstede's four cultural dimensions. They found, at the individual level of analysis, that the four value dimensions predict outcomes with similar strength. They also found that cultural values were most strongly related to emotions, followed by attitudes, then behaviors, and finally job performance. Additionally, the predictive power of the cultural values was significantly lower than that of personality traits and demographics for certain outcomes (e.g., job performance, turnover), but significantly higher for others (e.g., organizational commitment, team-related attitudes).

Just as importantly, Hofstede's cultural dimensions are related to work outcomes in theoretically meaningful ways (Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2006; Taras et al., 2010). Individualism, relative to collectivism, is negatively related to group cohesiveness and preference for teamwork, lower cooperation and compromising, less organizational citizenship behaviors, lower organizational commitment, poorer joint gains in negotiation, and poorer group performance (Arunachalam et al., 1998; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Van Dyne et al., 2000). However, individualism is also related to stronger avoidance of unethical behavior and greater directness of communication. Power distance is related to greater cooperation, more organizational commitment, lower feedback seeking, and less avoidance of unethical behavior. Uncertainty avoidance is related to greater cooperation, greater reliance on established norms and protocols, lower innovation, and greater organizational commitment and team commitment (Shane et al., 1995). Finally, masculinity (relative to femininity) is associated with poorer team cooperation, less cooperative negotiation behaviors, greater directness, less conflict avoidance, less avoidance of unethical behavior, and greater preference for inspirational leadership behavior (Steensma et al., 2000; Taras et al., 2010).

Taras and colleagues' (2010) review also indicated that cultural values were more strongly related to work outcomes for older, male, managerial, and more educated respondents. They hypothesized that this amplification of cultural values was due to the greater crystallization of individual cultural values. In other words, people develop and learn particular behavioral and cognitive patterns stemming from these values through consistent use. Over time, these patterns become more and more "crystallized" or automatic in nature—they come to dominate the way that individuals approach, think about, and perceive the world and amplify the effect that these

cultural values have on their behavior. This is particularly likely to happen as one grows older, if one has a more agentic self-construal (which is more common in men than women), and through participation in institutions where one acquires more leeway in letting one's values determine behavior (i.e., when one is more highly educated or in a managerial position within an organization).

Hofstede subsequently added two more cultural dimensions to his framework: *long term versus short term normative orientation* and *indulgence versus restraint*. The first describes cultures that are oriented towards future rewards, versus those that maintain traditional norms and are more oriented toward present gratification (Hofstede, 1991). This dimension was first identified by Bond and colleagues in Taiwan and Hong Kong (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) and has been linked to the fast-pace of economic growth in those places (Hofstede, 2001). The second describes cultures with an orientation toward unimpeded enjoyment and fun versus those that suppress and regulate these behaviors through strict social norms. While these two dimensions may seem conceptually similar, *indulgence versus restraint* is more about the feeling of control people have over their lives. Consequently, it is entirely possible for cultures to grant people a great deal of personal control over their lives (indulgence) while still motivating them to think about their behavior in a long-term fashion. For example, Luxembourg and Germany are nations that are relatively high on both dimensions.

The GLOBE Research Project

The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project began in the 1990s and has progressed into an enormous research effort utilizing over 200 researchers from a variety of disciplines all over the globe (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges,

Dastmalchian, and House, 2012). The team has collected data from over 15,000 participants in

nearly 100 countries. GLOBE's purpose was and continues to be to explore the complex effects

of culture on leadership and organizational effectiveness. The research built on lay theories of

leadership—otherwise known as implicit leadership theory (Lord & Maher, 1991)—to develop a

culturally sensitive theory of leadership (House et al., 2004). The GLOBE project has three

phases (Dorfman et al., 2012). Phases 1 and 2 implemented a multi-method program to examine

the relationship between national culture, leadership effectiveness, and societal phenomena. The

purpose of the 3rd and final GLOBE phase is to determine the manner in which national culture

influences executive leadership processes.

      The GLOBE Leader Attributes and Behavior Questionnaire was the primary leadership

survey instrument utilized in phases 1 and 2 (Dorfman et al., 2012). The final version included

112 leader attribute and behavior items, which included a wide variety of traits, skills, behaviors,

and abilities potentially relevant to leadership emergence and effectiveness. Participants rated all

112 attributes on a 1-7 scale, with a low of 1 indicating ''this behavior or characteristic greatly

inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader'' to a high of 7 indicating ''this behavior or

characteristic contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader" (House et al., 2004).

The ratings were then utilized to inform statistical grouping procedures that resulted in the

formation of 21 primary dimensions of leadership (House et al., 2004). A second order factor

analysis of the 21 dimensions produced what the GLOBE research team refers to as the 6

Culturally Endorsed Leadership Theories (CLTs) or Global Leadership Dimensions (House et

al., 2004).

These six global dimensions are: charismatic/value-based leadership, team-oriented leadership, participative leadership, humane-oriented leadership, autonomous leadership, and self-protective leadership (House et al., 2004). Charismatic leadership reflects the ability to inspire, to motivate, and to expect high performance outcomes from others based on firmly held core values. Team-oriented leadership emphasizes effective team building and implementation of a common purpose or goal among team members. Participative leadership reflects the degree to which managers involve others in making and implementing decisions (House et al., 2004). Humane-oriented leadership reflects supportive and considerate leadership and also includes compassion and generosity. Autonomous leadership refers to independent and individualistic leadership attributes. Finally, self-protective leadership focuses on ensuring the safety and security of the overall group and its individual members through status enhancement and face saving.

The findings of the GLOBE research project provided support for the relationship between culture and leadership prototype content (Dorfman et al., 2012). For example, researchers have found that leadership prototypes vary by the respondent's home country (Gerstner & Day, 1994; Hanges & Dickson, 2004; House et al., 2004), and national culture influences leadership behaviors through a society's expectations of a leader's behavior (Dorfman et al., 2012). Shaw (1990) and House et al. (1999) argue that culture is a major determinant of the commonality found in leadership prototypes for individuals within the same cultural group. GLOBE researchers were able to demonstrate that culturally similar societies can be clustered together (Gupta & Hanges, 2004) with meaningful differences in the content of the CLT profiles (Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004). These CLT dimensions represent societal level

leadership characteristics. For example, the United States and England are both in the Anglo cluster of countries. These countries scored higher on the CLT dimensions of Charismatic, Participative, Team and Humane Oriented Leadership and lower on the CLT dimensions of Autonomous and Self-Protective leadership. Contrastingly, China, a country in the Confucian Asia cluster, scores higher on the CLT dimensions of Self-Protective, Autonomous and Humane Leadership, and lower on the CLT dimensions of Charismatic, Team, and Participative leadership. The researchers also identified a number of universally endorsed leader characteristics that were rated by 95% of the countries in their data set as contributing to outstanding leadership (House et al,. 2004). Overall, the GLOBE research project has contributed to our understanding of the relationship between national cultural values and leadership expectations in the workplace (Dorfman et al., 2012).

The World Values Survey and the Inglehart-Welzel Cultural Map

The political scientists Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel have devised another framework for understanding national differences in culture through their analysis of data collected by the World Values Survey (WVS). This survey uses a common questionnaire to collect nationally representative samples across approximately 100 nations and has been in use since 1981. It is currently on its 7th wave of data collection. Each wave takes approximately 4 years to complete. Based on their analysis, Inglehart and Welzel (2005; World Values Survey, 2016) suggest that there are two major axes of cultural variation: *traditional versus secular-rational values* and *survival versus self-expression values*. *Traditional values* are characterized by a high emphasis on religion, traditional family values, deference to authority, and national pride, and a rejection of divorce, abortion, euthanasia, and suicide. By contrast, *secular-rational*

values place less emphasis on religion, traditional family values, and authority, and are more accepting of divorce, abortion, euthanasia, and suicide. On the other axis, *survival values* are characterized by an emphasis on economic and physical security and low levels of trust and tolerance. *Self-expression values* are characterized by greater tolerance of others, gender equality, environmental protection, and more equitable participation in economic and political decision-making. Wealthier nations tend to be higher on secular-rational and self-expression values, while economically poorer nations tend to be higher on traditional and survival values. As nations become wealthier and standards of living improve, an individual's existential security and sense of individual agency both increase, causing general cultural shifts from traditional and survival values to secular-rational and self-expression values (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; World Values Survey, 2016). However, all combinations between the two axes are possible. For example, the United States and Latin America are high in traditionalism and self-expression, while much of Eastern Europe is high in secular-rational and survival values, likely due in part to the influence of communism.

Differences on these values have been found to impact perceptions of work. Snir and Harpaz (2009) found that individual work investment—perceiving work to merely be a way of earning money—is greater in countries where survival values are high relative to countries with greater self-expression values. By contrast, work devotion—perceiving work to be an enjoyable pursuit above and beyond money—is greater in countries where self-expression values are high relative to countries with greater survival values. Job security is also more highly prized in countries with survival values (Inglehart & Oyserman, 2004). Finally, the findings concerning the relationship of Hofstede's individualism-collectivism to work may also apply to the axis of

survival versus self-expression; research suggests that they tap a similar underlying construct (Inglehart & Oyserman, 2004; Hofstede, 2001). Indeed, national mean scores on measures of both constructs are found to factor together and are correlated at approximately .66.

Tightness-Looseness

Tightness-looseness denotes the *strength of norms* and *tolerance for norm deviance* in a given cultural collective, where *norm strength* denotes the breadth of unwritten and institutionalized rules that exist as well as the degree of social and institutional pressure that individuals feel to follow them, and *tolerance for norm deviance* denotes the amount of punishment that results when norms are violated (Gelfand, Raver, Nishii, Leslie, Lun, Lim, et al., 2011). By definition, tight cultural collectives have high norm strength and low tolerance for deviance, while loose cultural collectives have low norm strength and high tolerance for deviance. As a construct, tightness-looseness was first devised in the field of anthropology (Pelto, 1968) and has since been extensively researched and developed into a theory of culture by Gelfand and colleagues (2006, 2011). This includes a) extensive theoretical discussion about tightness-looseness and its relationship with societies and organizations (Gelfand, Nishii, & Raver, 2006), and b) work demonstrating significant cultural variability on tightness-looseness between nations and its relationship with ecological threat and a variety of interrelated psychological variables (Gelfand, Raver, Nishii, Leslie, Lun, Lim, et al., 2011; Gelfand, Harrington, & Fernandez, in press). Prototypically tighter nations include Pakistan, Singapore, and Turkey, and prototypically looser nations include Ukraine, the Netherlands, and Brazil. Tightness-looseness is related to but distinct from other cultural dimensions—for example,

tightness is correlated with Hofstede's individualism at -.47.

Tightness-looseness relates to work in a variety of ways. Using meta-analysis, Taras, Kirkman, and Steel (2010) found that societal tightness-looseness moderated the effect that other cultural dimensions had upon organizational outcomes. More specifically, the relationship between cultural dimensions and various organizational outcomes was stronger in tighter versus looser nations. Crossland and Hambrick (2011) found that national tightness-looseness influences CEO discretion. As predicted given the higher constraint in tighter societies, CEO's have comparatively less discretion in tighter nations. Lower discretion, in turn, was associated with a weaker influence of CEO actions on organizational performance. Other researchers have found evidence that tightness increases behavioral synchronicity. In particular, Eun, Wang, and Xiao (2015) found that tighter countries exhibit more stock price co-movement or "herding", which is linked to lower market-wide and firm-specific variation in these societies. In other words, the stronger normative values and conformity that exist in tighter societies lead individuals to follow the pack when deciding how to invest their money.

Industrial-organizational psychologists have also investigated the relationship between tightness-looseness and creativity, an issue that impacts innovation (Chiu and Hong, CHAPTER, this volume). Chua, Roth, and Lemoine (2015) found that individuals from looser cultures are better at engaging and succeeding on creative tasks from foreign cultures, while individuals from tight cultures do poorer on foreign creative tasks and are less receptive to creative ideas from foreign cultures. This is consistent with evidence from Harrington and Gelfand (2014), who found poorer creativity outcomes for tighter states in the United States of America. However,

when working on local creative tasks from their own country or from other culturally tight

nations, individuals from tighter nations performed well (Chua et al., 2015).

Finally, researchers have also examined the relationship between tightness-looseness and

leadership. Toh and Leonardelli (2012) found that tighter nations generally had fewer women

emerge into top leadership positions relative to looser nations, primarily because increased

tightness engenders greater resistance to changing the traditional notion that leaders are men in

many cultures. However, they also found that when egalitarian norms are culturally predominant,

tighter nations exhibit greater leadership emergence for women relative to looser nations. Tight

and egalitarian nations in this data include Norway, Singapore, and Portugal. In sum, tightness

appears to sustain existing practices due to strict implementation and enforcement, egalitarian or

not. Aktas, Gelfand, and Hanges (2015) found that tightness-looseness influences perceptions of

effective leadership. Using national tightness-looseness data from Gelfand and colleagues (2011)

and leadership preferences from the GLOBE Study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, &

Gupta, 2004), they predicted and found that tightness is positively related to the endorsement of

autonomous leadership (i.e., leaders who make independent decisions without relying on others)

and negatively related to the endorsement of charismatic and team-oriented leadership, even after

controlling for other dimensions of culture such as power distance and individualism-

collectivism. The researchers surmise that autonomous leadership (vs. team-oriented leadership)

is valued in tighter societies because it produces quick decision-making and generally reinforces

the status quo, which is a boon for those higher in the psychological need for closure. The

researchers also suspect that the visionary and inspirational tactics associated with charismatic

leadership, which often upset the status quo, are viewed negatively in tighter cultures because

they tend to be counter to the dominant prevention-orientation of those societies. However, this is also the reason that individuals in looser cultures, which are often more open and innovative, view charismatic leadership styles as more effective.

Social Class and Work

While much of the research and theorizing about the interface of culture and work has understandably focused on nationality, it is also important to recognize that culture is not the exclusive purview of national differences. Indeed, regional differences are incredibly common within nations, for example (Rentfrow & Jokela, CHAPTER, this volume). Indeed, cultural differences in collectivism-individualism have been found in the United States (Vandello & Cohen, 1999) and Japan (Kitayama, Ishii, Imada, Takemura, & Ramaswamy, 2006), the U.S. South has been identified as an honor culture relative to other areas of the country (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996), and the U.S. states and regions have been found to differ substantially in tightness-looseness (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014), to take but a few examples. Anecdotes abound outside of the research literature as well. Within Spain, Catalonia is a very different culturally compared to Galicia, and the local culture experienced by an individual from Xinjiang in Western China would be very different than that experienced by someone in Shanghai.

Another important cultural distinction that goes beyond the focus on national differences is social class. Extensive research has identified wide-ranging cultural differences between the middle class and working class, particularly within the United States. Relative to the middle class, the working class tends to have a greater preference for interdependence and relational

orientation (Markus & Hamedani, CHAPTER, this volume; Stephens, Fryberg, Markus, Johnson, & Covarrubias, 2012; Stephens, Fryberg, & Markus, 2011; Snibbe & Markus, 2005) and a prioritization of behavioral conformity to externally defined standards (e.g., obedience to parents, neatness/cleanliness) rather than a concern for the internal processes of both the self and others (Kohn, 1969). This is likely due to the day-to-day economic situation of working class life. Indeed, the realities of low income and low social mobility often necessitate and produce increased closeness to family, friends, and community in working class communities. Relying on others to survive, for material and social support, and to get by when times are tough is a common occurrence. It is also adaptive for people low in social status and power to conform to the demands of authorities that can punish or withhold resources. Further, it has been found that working class individuals tend to rely on greater contextual and fewer dispositional explanations for a variety of phenomena (Grossman & Varnum, 2011; Varnum, Na, Murata, & Kitayama, 2011). This makes logical sense given how influential context may be in working class communities, where the external limits of one's employment status, income, and educational opportunities impact outcomes to a greater degree than in middle class lives.

Notably, it has been found that many of the cultural differences found between the American middle and working classes also appear to map well to social class differences outside of the United States. The working class value of conformity has been found in cultures as different as Italy (Kohn, 1969), Poland and Ukraine (Kohn, Zaborowski, Janicka, Khmelko, Mach, Paniotto et al., 2002), and Japan (Kohn, Naoi, Schoenbach, Schooler, & Slomcyznski, 1990), even after controlling for religious background, religiosity (i.e., church attendance), nationality, race, region, urban vs. rural location, and the age of the person in question (Kohn,

1969). Likewise, Grossman and Varnum (2010) found that the decrease in dispositional bias among the working class also occurred in Russia, a country with very different national value orientations relative to the United States (Hofstede, 1980; Grossman & Kross, 2010; Kühnen, Hannover, Roeder, Shah, Schubert, Upmeyer, & Zakaria, 2001; Nisbett, Peng, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2001). All of this indicates that social class is a very important cultural distinction in general, and its implications for understanding the interface of culture and work may be just as important as for national differences.

Most importantly, the type of work that the working class and the middle classes do is very different, so much so that it often comprises an important part of their identities. Indeed, members of the working class tend to have low status, physically-oriented "blue collar" occupations that offer a significant possibility of injury, dismemberment, or death on a daily basis (DiMaggio, 2012; Levison, 1974). Given how difficult this work can be, the working classes often laud the values of self-discipline and perseverance, and many take pride in doing "real work," something that they feel most people, particularly those from white-collar backgrounds, cannot or will not do (Lamont, 2000). They also face a higher degree of supervision and structure in their workplaces (Kohn, 1969; Schooler, 2007) relative to the middle class. By contrast, the "white collar" middle class tends to have occupations that are higher status, more unstructured, less physically intensive, and less physically dangerous (DiMaggio, 2012).

The type of work that each class group does may be the lynchpin that causes social class cultural differences. As demonstrated by Kohn (1969) in his seminal study of class differences, the differences in supervision, structure, and type of work between the working and middle class

lend themselves to very different sets of values and perceptions of one's place in society. The high supervision, structure, and routinization of working class occupations, for instance, often necessitate conformity to authority and rule abidance. These occupational factors predict greater authoritarian conservatism, greater endorsement of traditionalism and greater resistance to change, and greater belief in the influence of external forces on one's life. By contrast, the low supervision, structure, and routinization of middle class occupations foster a greater emphasis on self-direction and cultivate a greater belief in innovation and change and a stronger internal locus of control. Ultimately, both groups teach their children these particular sets of values, which prepare them for their future life as a member of a similar occupational environment (see Nisbett, CHAPTER, this volume).

Each class also has very different approaches and motivations toward work. The lower income and lower status of working class occupations in a society that more often lauds the contributions and importance of middle class occupations means that working class people tend to conceive of an occupation as "job" rather than a "career" (Argyle, 1994). Combined with the specter of sliding into poverty or "hard living" (Howell, 1972; Williams, 2012), this lends itself to viewing an occupation as a means to an end rather than an end itself. Indeed, this typically results in working class people placing a higher value on family before work (Williams, 2012), compared to those of the middle class.

Other predictions about the interface of social class cultural differences and work can be derived from this prior theoretical and empirical research. For example, cultural values may impact attraction and retention of individuals from different class backgrounds. As demonstrated by Stephens, Fryberg, Markus, Johnson, and Covarrubias (2012), working class individuals are

primarily motivated to acquire a university education for more interdependent reasons (e.g., helping their family and community). However, given that universities and colleges are primarily middle-class institutions, they often promote individualistic values (e.g., personal achievement) in their messaging and mission statements. The cultural mismatch that results has been shown to negatively impact the outcomes and success of working class university students in longitudinal research (Markus & Hamedani, CHAPTER, this volume). Similar value mismatch within work environments or organizations may likewise impact members from incongruent class groups. This is in line with much theorizing and research on the attraction-selection-attrition model (i.e., employees are attracted to, selected for, and more likely to stay in organizations that fit their values and attributes; Schneider, 1987). Overall, how social class culture impacts work across the world remains an important area for future research.

<div align="center">**Specific Cultural Workways**</div>

Workways describe the unique and signature pattern of workplace beliefs, mental models, and practices that embody a specific society's ideas about what is true, good and efficient within the domain of work (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007). One major focus of research on cultural workways is workplace relational styles (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007). Workplace relational styles refer to people's beliefs about the function of relationships in the workplace, as well as relational behaviors at work that reflect deep-seated ideologies about the nature of social-emotional ties within and across work domains. The following section highlights some key cultural workways and presents empirical research related to relational styles in each case.

Guanxi

Guanxi is the dominant relational norm of Chinese organizations, where business relations are characterized by a distinct emphasis on building dense networks of personal relationships (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007). Workers often conduct their business by making their social connections available to one another. This dense system of networks that characterizes the Chinese workplace differs from networking in Western businesses because of its transitive nature (Cai, 2001; Li, Tsui & Weldon, 2000). Whereas a Western businessperson may ask a colleague to facilitate a new connection, a Chinese businessperson operating under guanxi would assume that they have direct access to any person in a colleague's network. Due to the importance of social networks, it is also common for a Chinese businessperson to work with another person simply because they have a mutual acquaintance, because this is seen as a reassurance that the partner will be reliable (Sanchez-Burks, 2004). For many Chinese professionals, establishing guanxi is an essential condition to an effective working relationship (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007).

Farh and colleagues (1998) investigated the importance of guanxi and relational demography on trust in Chinese workplace relationships. Relational demography refers to similarities or differences between an individual and others on a variety of factors including age, gender, race, religion, education, and occupation. In Study 1, 560 supervisor-subordinate dyads completed surveys containing measures of trust in supervisor, commitment to the organization, subordinate performance, relational demography factors, and guanxi. Guanxi was measured in a checklist style format where both the supervisor and subordinate were asked if their specific dyad represented guanxi. If both partners in the dyad responded yes, the dyad was marked as having guanxi. Study 1 results indicated that guanxi was related to trust in a supervisor, a result

replicated in Study 2 with a sample of executives. Overall, their findings across both studies

illustrated that guanxi is a key factor in developing trust in Chinese business relationships, over

and above demographic similarities.

Simpatía

In Latin cultures, the relational script of simpatía is thought to guide workplace

relationships (Diaz-Guerrero, 1967; Sanchez-Burks, Nisbett, & Ybarra, 2000; Triandis, Marin,

Lisansky & Betancourt, 1984). Simpatía emphasizes social harmony, to the extent that

understanding and respecting others' feelings is valued above other concerns (Markus & Lin,

1999). Although this is similar to many East Asian cultures, simpatía also emphasizes expressive

displays of personal charm and hospitality in work contexts (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007).

Ramirez-Esperanzo, Gosling, and Pennebaker (2008) conducted an experimental study

examining the effects of language on warm and agreeable interpersonal behavior. Bilingual

Mexican Americans engaged in mock interviews in Spanish or English with a videotaped actor.

Independent judges unaware of the language in which the interview took place rated the number

of simpatia related behaviors participants engaged in during their interactions. Overall, bilinguals

performed more simpatia-related behaviors when the task was performed in Spanish as opposed

to English.

Protestant Relational Ideology

Workways in the United States differ from the culture-specific relationship styles

outlined above, in that they do not share the same emphasis on relationships at work (Sanchez-

Burks & Lee, 2007). The Protestant Relational Ideology (PRI), an ideology that combines

teachings about the importance of work with Calvinist imperatives for restricting relational

concerns while working, guides American relational styles (Sanchez-Burks, 2002). PRI is

characterized by a divide in relational attunement, or attention to affective issues and relational

concerns, between work and non-work contexts (Bendix, 1998). Specifically, relational

attunement among Americans is reduced in work settings compared to social, non-work settings

(Sanchez-Burks, 2004).

One of the main contributions of PRI was to provide a theoretical framework that

explains why and when Americans' interpersonal style differs from other cultural groups not

rooted in Calvinist Protestantism (Sanchez-Burks, 2004). Over two experimental studies,

Sanchez-Burks (2002) investigated the influence of Protestant Relational Ideology on emotional

expression and relational focus inside and outside of work settings. In the first study, individuals

participated in groups of four people. All participants were either Protestant or Catholic. The

groups were randomly assigned to a work or non-work contexts by dressing the participants

formally, in business shirts, or informally, in Hawaiian shirts. In the formal condition,

participants discussed a business case. Participants in the informal condition played a game.

After discussing the case or playing the game, participants were directed to individual cubicles.

Once separated, participants responded individually to a vocal Stroop task (Kitayama & Ishii,

1999) where they judged the pleasant or unpleasant valence of spoken words, some of which

were positive and some negative in meaning. Critical trials were those where the literal meaning

of a word was contradicted by the affective tone of voice in which it was spoken (ex. the word

"joyful" spoken in a sad voice). Attunement to emotion would be reflected in delays on critical

trials as participants would have difficulty separating out the meaning of the word from the way it was said. Results indicated that individuals raised in the Protestant tradition were less automatically attentive to affective tone of voice when a work context had recently been activated.

In the second study, participants took part individually. In the formal condition, the experimenter asked participants to dress for their session as they would for an important business interview. Participants in the informal condition dressed for a regular class. During the session, all participants worked with a research confederate on a shared task. The confederate was instructed to continuously shake their leg throughout the entire task. A measure of the participant's physical mimicry of the confederate, specifically leg shaking, was the dependent variable. The findings suggested that within a work setting Protestant males exhibited less relational focus than males from non-Protestant groups and than women in general, in that they engaged in less nonverbal mimicry. However, in social, nonwork contexts, Calvinist Protestants were just as likely to create a nonverbal rapport through mimicry as were non-Protestant Americans (Sanchez-Burks, 2002).

Summary

Research on cultural workways goes into greater depth to identify the specific mental models individuals from a given culture utilize to manage relationships in the workplace. Certain workplace relational styles, such as guanxi and simpatia, rely on a heightened sensitivity to interpersonal relationships and emotional stimuli in the workplace, consistent with collectivistic values. But at the same time, they do so in distinct ways, with simpatía emphasizing interpersonal agreeableness and humor, and guanxi more focused on long-term network ties.

Other cultural workways, such as Protestant Relational Ideology are steeped not only in individualism but in cultural history and religious traditions that place much less importance on relational concerns in work contexts. Although some scholars have argued that the globalization of the workplace may have reduced cross-cultural differences and that the world of work has begun to resemble a culture-free zone (Birnbaum-More & Wong, 1995), experimental research on workways suggests that cultural differences may actually be amplified in work contexts (Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2007; Sanchez-Burks, 2002).

Conclusion

Work is an important component of people's lives across cultures. Hence, it is important to understand the cross-cultural differences and similarities in how work is approached, conducted, and perceived the world over. In this chapter, we have attempted to distill our current understanding of the relationship between work and culture, and to review the many complementary approaches used to investigate it, including studies of objective indicators such as work hours and productivity, cross-national surveys of self-reported work values, and experimental approaches. These studies have identified important differences across and within nations in work behaviors and values, as well as their interactions with individual dispositions and situational factors. Multidisciplinary studies of specific cultural workways have further examined how the unique histories of certain countries have shaped the work values of those societies, as in the case of Protestant Relational Ideology in the United States.

Research in this area identifies unique ideologies that shape cultural understandings of how people should think, feel and act with regard to their work. These are critical for

understanding how and why cross-cultural differences emerge and when they may be

problematic for intercultural relations. Given work's dominant place in the center of everyday

life, understanding the cultural psychology of work is a critical component in managing the

intercultural contact that forms the backbone of the modern workplace, where individuals must

coordinate and cooperate despite deep-seated cultural differences. In all, research on culture and

work will continue to be an impactful and fascinating area of inquiry for many years to come.

References

Aktas, M., Gelfand, M., & Hanges, P. (2015). Cultural tightness–looseness and perceptions of effective leadership. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *47*(2), 294-309.

Argyle, M. (1994). *The psychology of social class*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Arunachalam, V., Wall Jr, J.A. and Chan, C. (1998). Hong Kong versus US negotiations: effects of culture, alternatives, outcome scales, and mediation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *28*(14), 1219–1244.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(8), 951-968.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set.* Mind Garden Inc., Redwood City, CA.

BBC. (May 11, 2016). The plan to ban work emails out of hours. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-36249647

Bendix, R. (1977). *Max Weber: An intellectual portrait.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Birnbaum-More, P. & Wong, G. (1995). Acquisition of managerial values in the People's Republic of China and Hong Kong. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26(3)*, 255-275.

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral,

gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological science*, *19*(3), 268-

275.

Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M. J., Francesco, A. M., Chen, Z. X., ... &

Shapiro, D. (2001). Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on

reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*(4), 300-315.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (October 26, 2015). Charts from the American Time Use Survey.

Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/tus/charts/

Cai, D. A. (2001). Looking below the surface: Comparing subtleties of U.S. and Chinese culture

in negotiation. In J. Weiss (Ed.), *Tigers roar: Asia's recovery and its impact* (pp. 217-

237). New York: Sharpe.

Cette, G., Chang, S., & Konte, M. (2011). The decreasing returns on working time: An empirical

analysis on panel country data. *Applied Economics Letters*, *18*(17), 1677-1682.

Chatman, J. A., & Barsade, S. G. (1995). Personality, organizational culture, and cooperation:

Evidence from a business simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 423-443.

Chatman, J. A., Polzer, J. T., Barsade, S. G., & Neale, M. A. (1998). Being different yet feeling

similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work

processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 749-780.

Chen, C. C., Chen, Y. R., & Xin, K. (2004). Guanxi practices and trust in management: A

procedural justice perspective. *Organization Science*, *15*(2), 200-209.

Chua, R. Y. J., Roth, Y., & Lemoine, J.-F. (2015). The impact of culture on creativity:

How cultural tightness and cultural distance affect global innovation crowdsourcing

work. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, *60*(2), 189-227.

Clark, G. (2008). *A farewell to alms: A brief economic history of the world*. Princeton, NJ:

Princeton University Press.

Cohen, D. (2001). Cultural variation: considerations and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*,

127(4), 451.

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through

the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *12*, 317-

372.

Crossland, C., & Hambrick, D. C. (2011). Differences in managerial discretion across

countries: How nation-level institutions affect the degree to which CEOs matter.

Strategic Management Journal, *32*(8), 797-819.

Daniels, M. A., & Greguras, G. J. (2014). Exploring the nature of power distance: Implications

for micro-and macro-level theories, processes, and outcomes. *Journal of Management*,

40(5), 1202-1229.

Diaz-Guerrero, R. (1967). *Psychology of the Mexican*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

DiMaggio, P. (2012). Sociological perspectives on the face-to-face enactment of class

distinction. In S. T. Fiske & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Facing social class: How societal rank

influences interaction* (pp. 15-38). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dorfman, P., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004). Leadership and cultural variation: The

identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M.

Javidan, P. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The

GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 667–718). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, *47*(4), 504-518.

Eun, C. S., Wang, L., & Xiao, S. C. (2015). Culture and R 2. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *115*(2), 283-303.

Gelfand, M., & Cai, D. A. (2004). Cultural structuring of the social context of negotiation. In M. J. Gelfand & J. M. Brett (Eds.), *The handbook of negotiation and culture* (pp. 238-257). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gelfand, M. J., Harrington, J. R., & Fernandez, J. (in press). Cultural tightness-looseness: Ecological determinants and implications for personality. In A. T. Church (Ed.), *Personality across cultures*.

Gelfand, M. J., Nishii, L. H., & Raver, J. L. (2006). On the nature and important of cultural tightness-looseness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(6), 1225-1244.

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., … & Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, *332*(6033), 1100-1104.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *5*(2), 121-134.

Grossman, I., & Kross, E. (2010). The impact of culture on adaptive vs. maladaptive self-reflection. *Psychological Science*, *21*(8), 1150-1157.

Grossmann, I., & Varnum, M. E. W. (2011). Social class, culture, and cognition. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 2*(1), 81-89.

Goncalo, J. A., & Staw, B. M. (2006). Individualism–collectivism and group creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *100*(1), 96-109.

Gupta, V., & Hanges, P. (2004). Regional and climate clustering of societal cultures. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 178–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hall, R. E. & Jones, C. I. (1999). Why do some countries produce so much more output per worker than others. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *114*(1), 83-116.

Hanges, P. J., & Wang, M. (2012). Seeking the holy grail in organizational science: Uncovering causality through research design. In S. J. Kozlowski, S. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology, Vol. 1* (pp. 79-116). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Harrington, J. R., & Gelfand, M. J. (2014). Tightness–looseness across the 50 United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *111*(22), 7990-7995.

Heine, S. J., & Hamamura, T. (2007). In search of East Asian self-enhancement. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*(1), 4-27.

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

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

Hofstede, G. (1994). Management scientists are human. *Management Science, 40(1),* 4-14.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and*

organizations across nations (2nd ed*.). Beverly Hills CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *7*(1), 81-94.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture*, *2*(1), 8.

Holtgraves, T. (1997). Styles of language use: Individual and cultural variability in conversational indirectness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*(3), 624.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage Publications.

House, R. J., Wright, N. S., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *The New Lexington Press management and organization sciences series and New Lexington Press social and behavioral sciences series. New perspectives on international industrial/ organizational psychology* (pp. 535-625). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press/Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J. T. (1972). *Hard living on clay street: Portraits of blue-collar families.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Inglehart, R., & Oyserman, D. (2004). Individualism, autonomy, self-expression. The human development syndrome. *International Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 74-96.

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*. Cambridge University Press.

Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., De Luque, M. S., & House, R. J. (2006). In the eye of the

    beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from project GLOBE. *The Academy of*

    Management Perspectives, *20*(1), 67-90.

Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power

    distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level,

    cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(4), 744-764.

    doi:10.5465/AMJ.2009.43669971

Kitayama, S., Ishii, K., Imada, T., Takemura, K., & Ramaswamy, J. (2006). Voluntary settlement

    and the spirit of independence: Evidence from Japan's "northern frontier". *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, *91*(3), 369-384.

Kitayama, S., Park, J., Boylan, J. M., Miyamoto, Y., Levine, C. S., Markus, H. R., Karasawa, M.,

    Coe, C. L., Kawakami, N., Love, G. D., Ryff, C. D. (2015). Anger expression and

    ill-health in two cultures: An examination of inflammation and cardiovascular risk.

    Psychological Science, *26*(2), 211-220.

Kivimäki, M., Virtanen, M., Kawachi, I., Nyberg, S. T., Alfredsson, L., Batty, G. D., ... &

    Dragano, N. (2015). Long working hours, socioeconomic status, and the risk of incident

    type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of published and unpublished data from 222 120

    individuals. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, *3*(1), 27-34.

Kohn, M. L. (1969). *Class and conformity: A study in values*. Chicago, IL: University of

    Chicago Press.

Kohn, M. L., Naoi, A., Schoenbach, C., Schooler, C., & Slomczynski, K. M. (1990).

Position in the class structure and psychological functioning in the United States, Japan, and Poland. *American Journal of Sociology*, *95*(4), 964-1008.

Kohn, M. L., Zaborowski, W., Janicka, K., Khmelko, V., Mach, B. W., Paniotto, V., Slomczynski, K. M., Heyman, C., & Podobnik, B. (2002). Structural location and personality during the transformation of Poland and Ukraine. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *65*(4), 364-385.

Kühnen, U., Hannover, B., Roeder, U. R., Shah, A. A., Schubert, B., Upmeyer, A., & Zakaria, S. (2001). Cross-cultural variations in identifying embedded figures: Comparisons from the United States, Germany, Russia, and Malaysia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*(3), 365-371.

Lamont, M. (2000). *The dignity of working men: Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Leary, M. R. (2007). Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 317-344.

Lee, S. W., Oyserman, D., & Bond, M. H. (2010). Am I doing better than you? That depends on whether you ask me in English or Chinese: Self-enhancement effects of language as a cultural mindset prime. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(5), 785-791.

Leung, K., & Bond, M.H. (1984). The impact of cultural collectivism on reward allocation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 793–804.

Leung, K., Au, Y. F., Fernández-Dols, J. M., & Iwawaki, S. (1992). Preference for methods of conflict processing in two collectivist cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*, *27*(2), 195-209.

Leung, K., & Fan, R. M. (1997). Dispute processing: An Asian perspective. In H. R. Kao, D.

    Sinha, H. R. Kao, D. Sinha (Eds.), *Asian perspectives on psychology* (pp. 201-217).

    Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Levison, A. (1974). *The working-class majority* (Vol. 4084). Penguin books.

Li, J., Tsui, A., & Weldon, E. (2000). *Management and organization in the Chinese context*.

    New York: Macmillan.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions*

    and performance (Vol. 1). Cambridge, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Markus, H. R. & Lin, L. R. (1999). Conflictways: Cultural diversity in the meanings and

    practices of conflict. In D. A. Prentice and D. R. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides:*

    Understanding and overcoming group conflict (p. 302-333). New York: Russell Sage.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion,

    and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224.

Mizunoya, T. (2002). An international comparison of unpaid overtime work among

    industrialized countries. *ILO% International labor Organization*. Retrieved from

    http://www.ilo.int/public/english/bureau/stat/download/articles/2002-3.pdf

Moorman, R.H. and Blakely, G.L. (1995) Individualism–collectivism as an

    individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of*

    Organizational Behavior, *16*(2), 127–142.

Moran, C. M., Diefendorff, J. M., & Greguras, G. J. (2013). Understanding emotional display

    rules at work and outside of work: The effects of country and gender. *Motivation And*

    Emotion, *37*(2), 323-334.

Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the south*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. *Psychological Review*, *108*(2), 291-310.

Offermann, L. R., & Hellmann, P. S. (1997). Culture's consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *28*(3), 342-351.

Ohbuchi, K. I., Fukushima, O., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Cultural values in conflict management: Goal orientation, goal attainment, and tactical decision. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *30*(1), 51-71.

Our World in Data. (2016). [Graph illustration of the relationship between productivity and work hours across nations]. *Productivity vs. Work Hours, 2016*. Retrieved from https://ourworldindata.org/working-hours/

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(1), 3.

Park, J., Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Coe, C. L., Miyamoto, Y., Karasawa, M., Curhan, K. B., Love, G. D., Kawakami, N., Boylan, J. M., & Ryff, C. D. (2013). Social status and anger expression: The cultural moderation hypothesis. *Emotion*, *13*(6), 1122-1131.

Pelto, P. J. (1968). The differences between "tight" and "loose" societies. *Society*, *5*(5), 37-40.3

Pencavel, J. (2015). The productivity of working hours. *The Economic Journal*, *125*(589), 2052-2076.

Ramírez-Esparza, N., Gosling, S. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Paradox lost: Unraveling the

puzzle of simpatía. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *39*(6), 703-715.

Reuters. (April 19, 2016). Death by overwork on rise among Japan's vulnerable workers.

Retrieved from:

http://www.reuters.com/article/us-japan-economy-overwork-idUSKCN0X000F

Sanchez-Burks, J. (2002). Protestant relational ideology and (in) attention to relational cues in

work settings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(4), 919.

Sanchez-Burks, J. (2005). Protestant relational ideology: The cognitive underpinnings and

organizational implications of an American anomaly. In R. Kramer & B. Staw (Eds.),

Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 26, pp. 265-305). New York: Elsevier.

Sanchez-Burks, J., Bartel, C. A., & Blount, S. (2009). Performance in intercultural interactions at

work: cross-cultural differences in response to behavioral mirroring. *Journal of Applied

Psychology*, *94*(1), 216.

Sanchez-Burks, J., & Lee, F. (2007). Cultural psychology of workways. *Handbook of Cultural

Psychology*, *1*, 346-369.

Sanchez-Burks, J., Lee, F., Choi, I., Nisbett, R., Zhao, S., & Koo, J. (2003). Conversing across

cultures: East-West communication styles in work and nonwork contexts. *Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*(2), 363.

Sanchez-Burks, J., Nisbett, R. E., & Ybarra, O. (2000). Cultural styles, relational schemas, and

prejudice against out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(2), 174-

189.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, *40*(3), 437-453.

Schooler, C. (2007). Culture and social structure: The relevance of social structure. In S.

Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Psychology* (pp. 370-388). New

York, NY: Guilford Press.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. K., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team

values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied

Psychology*, *92*(4), 1020-1030. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1020

Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. *Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(1), 60.

Shane, S., Venkataraman, S. and MacMillan, I. (1995). Cultural differences in innovation

championing strategies. *Journal of Management*, *21*(5), 931–952.

Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management.

Academy of Management Review, *15*(4), 626-645.

Shepard, E., & Clifton, T. (2000). Are longer hours reducing productivity in

manufacturing? *International Journal of Manpower*, *21*(7), 540-553.

Snir, R., & Harpaz, I. (2009). Cross-cultural differences concerning heavy work

investment. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *43*(4), 309-319.

Snibbe, A. C., & Markus, H. R. (2005). You can't always get what you want: Social class,

agency, and choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*(4), 703-720.

Steensma, H.K., Marino, L. and Weaver, K.M. (2000). Attitudes toward cooperative strategies: a

cross-cultural analysis of entrepreneurs. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *31*(4),

591–609.

Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., & Markus, H. R. (2011). When choice does not equal

freedom: A sociocultural analysis of agency in working-class American contexts. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *2*(1), 33-41.

Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., Johnson, C. S., & Covarrubias, R. (2012). Unseen disadvantage: How American universities' focus on independence undermines the academic performance of first-generation college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(6), 1178-1197.

Taras, V. (2014). *X-culture database*. Data publication. Published Jun 25, 2014, Wikidemix: http://wikidemix.org/x-culture-database-codebook/

Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of Culture's consequences: a three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(3), 405.

Taras, V., & Ordeñana, X. (2015). X-Culture: Challenges and Best Practices of Large-Scale Experiential Collaborative Projects. In V. Taras & M. A. Gonzalez-Perez (Eds.), *The Handbook of Experiential Learning in International Business* (pp. 131-149). Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

The Conference Board. (2016). *Total economy database*. Retrieved from https://www.conference-board.org/data/economydatabase/index.cfm?id=25667

Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: The effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(1), 86-94.

Toh, S. M., & Leonardelli, G. J. (2012). Cultural constraints on the emergence of women as leaders. *Journal of World Business*, *47*(4), 604-611.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96*, 506- 520.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality*, *69*(6), 907-924.

Triandis, H. C., Marin, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, H. (1984). Simpatía as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*(6), 1363-1375.

Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S., & Ou, A. Y. (2007). Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations. *Journal of Management, 33*, 426-478.

Uhlmann, E. L., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2014). The implicit legacy of American Protestantism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *45*(6), 992-1006.

Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (1999). Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(2), 279-292.

Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M.E. and Cummings, L.L. (2000). Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(1), 3–23.

Varnum, M. E., Na, J., Murata, A., & Kitayama, S. (2012). Social class differences in N400 indicate differences in spontaneous trait inference. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *141*(3), 518-526.

Virtanen, M., Ferrie, J., Gimeno, D., Vahtera, J., Elovainio, M., Singh-Manoux, A., ... &

Kivimäki, M. (2009). Long working hours and sleep disturbances: the Whitehall II prospective cohort study. *Sleep*, *32*(6), 737-45.

Virtanen, M., Ferrie, J. E., Singh-Manoux, A., Shipley, M. J., Vahtera, J., Marmot, M. G., & Kivimäki, M. (2010). Overtime work and incident coronary heart disease: the Whitehall II prospective cohort study. *European Heart Journal*, *31*(14), 1737-1744.

Virtanen, M., Heikkilä, K., Jokela, M., Ferrie, J. E., Batty, G. D., Vahtera, J., & Kivimäki, M. (2012). Long working hours and coronary heart disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *176*(7), 586-596.

Virtanen, M., Jokela, M., Nyberg, S. T., Madsen, I. E., Lallukka, T., Ahola, K., ... & Burr, H. (2015). Long working hours and alcohol use: systematic review and meta-analysis of published studies and unpublished individual participant data. *BMJ*, *350*, g7772.

Virtanen, M., Singh-Manoux, A., Ferrie, J. E., Gimeno, D., Marmot, M. G., Elovainio, M., ... & Kivimäki, M. (2009). Long working hours and cognitive function the Whitehall II Study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *169*(5), 596-605.

Virtanen, M., Stansfeld, S. A., Fuhrer, R., Ferrie, J. E., & Kivimäki, M. (2012). Overtime work as a predictor of major depressive episode: a 5-year follow-up of the Whitehall II study. *PloS one*, *7*(1), e30719.

Voronov, M., & Singer, J. A. (2002). The myth of individualism-collectivism: A critical review. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *142*(4), 461-480.

Wagner, J. A. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 152-173.

Williams, J. C. (2012). The class culture gap. In S. T. Fiske & H. R. Markus (Eds.),

Facing social class: How societal rank influences interaction (pp. 39-57). New York,

NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

World Values Survey. (2016). Findings and insights. Retrieved from

http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp