

Working Paper 236

Individualism-Collectivism Orientation and
Employee Attitudes:
A Comparison of Employees from India and Ireland

By

Amit Gupta
Nagarajan Ramamoorthy
Subodh P. Kulkarni

June 2005

Please address all correspondence to:

Amit Gupta
Assistant Professor, OBHRM
Indian Institute of Management – Bangalore
Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore 560 076, India
Email: amitg@iimb.ernet.in
Phone: +91-80-6993322, Fax: +91-80-2658 4050

Nagarajan Ramamoorthy
Assistant Professor of Management
University of Houston-Victoria
14000 University Boulevard
Sugarland, TX 77479, USA
Email: ramamoorthyn@uhv.edu
Phone: +1 (281) 275-3381

Subodh P. Kulkarni
Associate Professor of Management
School of Business, Howard University
2600 Sixth Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20059, USA
E-mail: skulkarni@howard.edu
Phone: +1 (202) 806-1539



तेजसिन्धु नायर्धातमस्तु

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT BANGALORE
Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore 560076, INDIA

**Individualism-Collectivism Orientation and Employee Attitudes:
A Comparison of Employees from India and Ireland**

ABSTRACT

Research on cross-cultural management has suggested that employee attitudes and values differ across cultures. This stream of research suggests that managerial practices that are successful in one culture may not be successful in another culture. Hofstede's (1980) study on cultural values suggests that Indians tend to be more collectivist, whereas the Irish tend to be more individualistic. However, both Ireland and India tended to be similar in terms of weak uncertainty avoidance. In this study, consistent with the suggestion that Irish are more individualistic and Indians are more collectivists, we hypothesized and found significantly higher levels of normative and affective commitment, and willingness to expend extra effort on the job for the Indian employees, compared with the Irish employees. Yet, contrary to our expectation, Irish employees reported greater intent to stay with the current organization than the Indian employees.

INTRODUCTION

Generally, positive employee attitudes such as commitment to the organization, willingness to extend extra effort and intent to stay with the organizations have been shown to produce positive organizational outcomes such as improved individual performance, reduction in the cost of hiring and training, and indirectly contribute to enhanced organizational performance (e.g.,). Further, studies have also shown that systematic differences exist between cultures in terms of employee attitudes (Budhwar and Khatri, 2001; Budhwar and Sparrow, 2002; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2005). The study of cultural influence on management practices and the effects of such practices on work attitudes have become critical in view of increased globalization (Kiessling & Harvey, 2005). Some scholars have claimed that the managerial practices differ across cultures and one size does not fit all cultures (Hofstede, 1993; Huo & Huang, 2002). Some others have pointed out that globalization is sometimes accompanied by *convergence* of managerial practices (Cowen, 2005; Gooderham & Brewster, 2003) with multinational corporations (MNCs) transplanting the successful practices in one culture into another culture. A few others take the position that local managerial practices may *coexist* with global ones, and that there may be a *crossvergence* between the two types of practices (Budhwar & Khatri, 2001; Budhwar & Sparrow, 2002; Entekin & Chung, 2001; Khilji, 2002). Despite the debate on whether there is convergence or divergence of management practices, one thing that is certain is that positive work attitudes are of paramount importance to any organization, whether local or multi-national.

Since Hofstede's (1980) pioneering work on cultures several studies have examined the effects of individualism-collectivism (I/C) orientations on work attitudes and behaviors, both using nationality as a surrogate for I/C and systematically measuring I/C orientations. The work attitudes that I/C has been shown to affect include team loyalty, pro-social behaviors, attitudes towards a variety of HRM practices such as performance appraisal, reward systems, and staffing practices, cooperation in group settings, effort, commitment, and tenure intent (Clugston, Howell & Dorfman, 2000; Gomez-Mejia & Welbourne, 1991; Moorman & Blakeley, 1995; Parkes, Bochner & Schneider, 2001; Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2002; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2005; Sosik & Jung, 2001; Wagner, 1995). Although cultural differences may exist across cultures, a few studies have suggested that global organizations may still be able to find a fit between employees and their managerial practices to the extent intra-cultural variations on I/C at the individual levels may exist (Parkes, Bochner, & Schneider, 2001; Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2002). In light of these suggestions, the goals of the present study are: (1) Do work attitudes differ between India and Ireland that may arise out of individualistic values of Irish employees and collectivist values of Indian employees (Hofstede, 1980) as reported in prior research? (2) Do intra-cultural variations on I/C orientations of employees predict their work attitudes? In doing so, we are hypothesizing and treating I/C as a multi-dimensional, as opposed to a uni-dimensional, individual difference variable consistent with prior research (Kagitcibasi, 1994; Schwartz, 1994; Triandis, 1994; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990).

For this study, we chose the following work attitudes: affective commitment, normative commitment, willingness to expend extra effort on the job (extra effort) and intention to stay with the organization (tenure intent). Our study should be of considerable interest to researchers and human resource managers for the following reasons: First, organizational commitment, extra effort, and tenure intent have been shown to have desirable behavioral consequences, such as performance, employee retention, attendance and

citizenship behaviors (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1996; Clugston, et al, 2000; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Milkovich & Newman, 2000; Shore & Martin, 1989; Stewart & Barrick, 2000). Second, we examine the cultural influence at the *national*, as well as the *individual* level. Thus, the findings of this study may be of interest not only for global managers and cross-cultural researchers but for any organization, domestic or global in operations. Finally, the comparison of cultural influences among Indian and Irish employees in itself is interesting because both India and Ireland have liberalized their economies, and have attracted a high volume of foreign direct investments particularly in the high-technology sector; which in turn, has impacted the management practices in both countries (Budhwar and Sparrow, 1997; Burnham, 2003; Budhwar and Khatri, 2001; O'Malley and O'Gorman, 2001). In addition, the Indian national culture shows a strong emphasis on collectivism, whereas the Irish culture is more individualistic (Berman, Murphy-Berman, & Singh, 1985; Hofstede, 1980). Thus, our study may provide some insight into cross-cultural differences in the value systems and work attitudes.

Our paper is organized into four sections. First, we briefly discuss the nature of individualism and collectivism, and hypothesize its relationship with various outcome variables, both at the cultural level and at the individual level. Specifically, we propose that collectivist Indians will report greater commitment to the organization, extra effort, and tenure intent. Further, we also propose that a higher level of individualism orientation will be negatively related to commitment, extra effort, and tenure intent. In the next section, we discuss the methodology used to test the hypotheses. The third section presents the data analysis and results for our study. Finally we will discuss the implications of our study, and suggest directions for future research in the area.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES

Individualism/Collectivism and Organizational Commitment

Hofstede (1980) introduced individualism-collectivism (I/C) to the cross-cultural management literature as a cultural level variable. In a broad sense, individualism can be conceptualized as an orientation towards the self as an autonomous individual embedded by one's own skin. Collectivism, in contrast, refers to a state wherein an individual's identity is submerged in the broader society or group to which one belongs. One of the key defining characteristics of I/C is the emphasis placed on individual goals versus collective goals. Individualists place a greater emphasis on self interest, personal goals and personal achievement compared with collectivists. Competition is considered to be a key behavioral characteristic of an individualist to achieve his/her goals (Probst et al., 1999). Collectivists consider the subordination of one's personal goals for the sake of the larger collective to which one belongs and seek to achieve results through cooperation. Whenever individual goals and group goal's are in conflict Individualism places the rights and goals of the individuals ahead of the rights and goals of the group to which he/she belongs, whereas collectivism places the group's rights and goals ahead of the individual goals/rights (Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998). In addition, the relationship between an employee and the organization is considered to be contractual or agency in nature in individualistic societies. On the contrary, in collectivist societies, the relationship between an employee and the employer transcends such agency perspective and extends to mutual moral commitments on the part of the contracting parties such as the employees and the employer (Gomez-Mejia & Welbourne, 1991).

Organizational commitment has a long history of research (Porter, Steers, Mowday, Boulian, 1974; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Organizational commitment is associated with identification of the employee with the organization, involvement of employee in the organization, and a psychological link between the employee and the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997). It is linked with important organizational variables like attitudes towards work, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, job involvement and career commitment among others (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Meyer and Allen, 1997). Organizational commitment has been shown to be a multidimensional construct comprising of behavioral and attitudinal dimensions (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Brown, 1996). Meyer & Allen (1991) have proposed a three-component view of organizational commitment comprising of affective, continuance and normative commitments, which have been classified under attitudinal commitment by Brown (1996). The first dimension of organizational commitment – ‘*affective commitment*’ – refers to the state in which an employee identifies with the organization, is involved in and emotionally attached to the organization and its goals and values. *Continuance commitment* is associated with the investments that the employee makes in staying with the organization that increases the costs associated with leaving the organization. *Normative commitment*, on the other hand, refers to the personal loyalty and moral obligations towards the organization. The three dimensions have been found to be conceptually distinct and based on factor analytic studies, distinguishable from each other (Allen and Meyer, 1996).

In this study, we examine the affects of individualism-collectivism on affective and normative commitment. We argue that in collectivist cultures, individuals will have greater identification and commitment with the organization, the values and goals of the organization, and will be willing to sacrifice their personal goals for the greater good of the organization. In collectivist cultures, individuals will also exhibit personal loyalty and moral obligations to the organization to a greater extent. The organizations in collectivist cultures will emphasize group objectives and group rewards and base performance appraisal on organizational loyalty rather than strictly individual achievement and performance. Also, in return for this affective and normative commitment, organizations may provide a level of job security for the employees and take care of the employees beyond the scope of employment contract. On the other hand, individualistic cultures tend to emphasize individual rights, individual achievements, personal growth and development. The nature of employment between the organization and the individual is contractual and based on agency. The organization does not expect its employees to be deeply committed and loyal to the organization, the employee also does not commits himself/herself to the organization beyond the normal contractual obligations (Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998). The differential perspectives on personal versus group’s goals and the nature of contractual relationships – agency versus moralistic – may result in employees in collectivist societies being more committed – normatively and affectively – to the organization. In light of this, we propose that:

Hypothesis 1: Indian employees should display higher levels of affective commitment than Irish employees.

Hypothesis 1(a): A higher level of individualism orientation will be negatively related to affective commitment.

Hypothesis 2: Indian employees will display higher levels of normative commitment than Irish employees.

Hypothesis 2(a): A higher level of individualism orientation will be negatively related to normative commitment.

Individualism/Collectivism and Extra Effort

Willingness to put in extra effort to achieve the goals of the organization has been defined as pro-social behavior or organization citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988, 1997). Extra effort would mean that employees are willing to exhibit on the job behaviors that are discretionary, might not be related to the organizational reward systems or captured by the employees job description, but such behaviors are critical to the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). In collectivist cultures, organizations tend to be considered as an extended family by its employees. The exchange between the employees and the organization is not limited to the job description or a formal employment contract. Employees have greater commitment with the organization and identify with the goals and success of the organization to a greater extent. Organizations in turn are expected to take care of its employees beyond their normal contractual obligations (Moorman, 1991; Organ, 1997). There is an implicit expectation from employees that they would be willing to go beyond the formal job roles and responsibilities and not be bound by it. Organizations expect the employees to help their coworkers, and carry out tasks that are not formally defined. Such activities tend to benefit the organizations, which are considered part of an employee's extended family. In fact, many organizations may not even have formal job descriptions. The employees are expected to work extra hours when needed. Therefore under a collectivist orientation, there would be an expectation on part of the organization and also a greater willingness on part of the employees to put in extra effort to get the work done in order to ensure that the organization is successful. Thus, in collectivist cultures the employer-employee relationship may be more moralistic than contractual that are generally prevalent in individualistic cultures. Hence, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3: Indian employees will display higher levels of 'extra effort on the job' than Irish employees.

Hypothesis 3(a): A higher level of individualism orientation will be negatively related to propensity to expend extra effort on the job.

Individualism/Collectivism and Employee Tenure

Gomez-Mejia and Welborne (1991) suggest that collectivist orientation may be associated to a greater extent with job security, loyalty to the organization and a greater emphasis on the social network within the organization. An individualistic orientation, on the other hand, would be associated with personal achievement and goals that may result in employees constantly looking to further their own career goals and opportunities for growth with less loyalty to the organization. Parkes et al (2001) showed that collectivists tended to be more committed to their organization and exhibited longer tenure with the organization they worked for than individualists. In collectivist cultures, job security and life-time employment are generally taken for granted compared to individualistic cultures. While the organizations expect its employees to be committed and loyal to the organizations, the organizations also tend to reciprocate such expectations through commitments of long-term employment and/or lifetime employment (Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998; Gomez-Mejia & Welbourne, 1991). Thus, the employees tend to invest effort to develop organization specific skills and knowledge and the organizations tend to reciprocate this by lifetime employment and other

benefits, the result being creation of a close interdependence between the employee and the organization. Such commitment may result in higher tenure with the organizations as supported by several studies on organizational commitment-tenure intent relationship (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Therefore, employees should be more reluctant to leave the organization voluntarily, and their organizations should be more resistant to lay them off, *ceteris paribus*. In light of this, we are proposing the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: Indian employees will display higher levels of tenure intent than Irish employees.

Hypothesis 4(a): A higher level of individualism orientation will be negatively related to tenure intent.

METHOD

Sample

We used a survey design to gather data from the participants. We collected data from five-hundred and ninety five (595) employees in Ireland and in India. Four-hundred and sixty-seven employees from several organizations in Ireland participated in the study. In India, one-hundred and twenty-eight employees from high-technology sector in Bangalore completed the survey.

Of the Indian sample, 18 (14.1%) participants identified themselves as between the ages of 18-25, 107 (83.6%) identified themselves as between the ages of 26-35, and two participants (1.6%) identified themselves as between the ages of 36-45 with 1 missing data. Seventy-seven employees (60.2%) from India were male and five employees (3.9%) were females with forty-six (46) employees (35.9%) not disclosing their gender.

Of the Irish sample, 117 (25.1%) participants identified themselves as between the ages of 18-25, 218 (46.7%) identified themselves as between the ages of 26-35, and 107 (22.9%) identified themselves as between the ages of 36-45, 21 participants (4.5%) identified themselves as between the ages of 46-55, and three participants identified themselves as over 55 (0.6%) with 1 missing data. One hundred and sixty two employees (34.7%) from Ireland were male and three hundred and three employees (64.9%) were females with 2 employees (0.4%) not disclosing their gender.

Measures

Affective Commitment. We measured this construct using the Mowday, Steers and Porter's (1979) Organization Commitment Questionnaire. This scale consisted of the following items: (1) I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to make my company be successful. (2) I recommend this company to my friends as a great place to work. (3) I am proud to tell others I am part of my company. (4) I am extremely glad that I chose my company to work for over others and (5) I really care about the fate of my company. Participants' responses were collected using a five-point Likert-type scale with '1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree' as anchors. This scale exhibited a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85. Data coding was done in such a way that a higher score indicated a higher level of affective commitment.

Normative commitment. We assessed normative commitment using four items from Allen and Meyer's (1990) scale. These four items were: (1) It is not right for me to leave the company even if it were to my advantage; (2) I feel guilty if I left the company now; (3) The company deserves my loyalty; and (4) I owe a great deal to the company with '1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree' as anchors. The Cronbach alpha of this scale was 0.78. Data coding was done in such a way that a higher score indicated a higher level of commitment.

Extra Effort: We used Ramamoorthy & Flood's (2002) measure of extra effort that asked the participants to indicate the extent to which they felt obliged to engage in each of the following behaviors: (1) I am willing to volunteer to do non-required tasks; (2) I am willing to work extra hours for the team; and (3) I am willing to assist other team members with their work. This measure yielded a coefficient alpha of 0.63. The data were coded, such that a higher score indicated greater willingness to put in extra effort on the job.

Tenure intent. We asked the participants to indicate how long they intended to stay with their current employer using one item. This item asked the participants to indicate how long they intended to stay with their employer with '1' = less than one year, '2' = more than one year but less than two years, '3' = more than two years but less than three years, '4' = more than three years but less than four years, '5' = more than four years but less than five years, and '6' = more than five years as responses. A higher score on this variable indicated a greater intent to stay with the employer.

Data Analysis Strategy

Since the Indian sample had several missing information on gender, we conducted a series of t-tests on the four outcome variables with gender as the grouping variable for the Indian sample. Among the available data, no significant gender differences were observed. Thus, the missing data do not seem to affect the results and hence, we decided not to control for gender in the test of the four hypotheses. All of the hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression.

Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, & 4 propose that Indian employees will report a greater level of affective and normative commitment, a higher level of extra effort, and greater intent to stay with the organization than Irish employees. We dummy coded nationality (India = 0; Ireland = 1) and entered nationality in the first step. Hence, a negative but statistically significant beta for nationality should render support for hypotheses 1 to 4. Hypotheses 1(a), 2(a), 3(a), and 4(a) propose that individuals' individualism orientation will be negatively related to affective commitment, normative commitment, tenure intent, and extra effort. In the second step, we entered the four I/C dimensions (solitary work preference, competitiveness, supremacy of individual goals, and self-reliance). Since a higher score on these dimensions indicates a higher level of individualism and conversely a lower score indicates a higher level of collectivism, a negative but statistically significant beta for the I/C dimensions should render support for hypotheses 1(a), 2(a), 3(a), and 4(a). We used the F-ratio test for incremental variance (Pedhazur, 1982) to test for the statistical significance of the set of variables entered in each step. To test for the significance of betas, we used the one-tail t-tests. In the next section, we present the results of our study.

RESULTS

We conducted a t-test for differences on I/C to validate our a priori expectations that Indian employees were more collectivists than Irish employees. The results of the t-tests are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

As can be seen from Table 1, Indians were less individualistic than Irish on the supremacy of individual interest and solitary work preference dimensions of I/C or conversely they exhibited more collectivist orientations than Irish. However, on the competitiveness dimension of I/C, Indians tended to report higher individualistic tendencies than Irish with the self-reliance dimension of I/C yielding no statistically significant differences. Overall, Indians tended to be more collectivist on supremacy of individual goals and solitary work preference dimensions than Irish but more individualistic on the competitiveness dimension of I/C.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables used in the study. Table 3 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analyses that tested the various hypotheses included in this study.

Insert Tables 2 & 3 about here

Hypotheses 1 and 2 suggest that collectivist Indians will display a greater level of affective and normative commitments than the Irish who are more individualistic. Consistent with the above hypotheses, the results show that the Indian employees displayed significantly higher levels of affective commitment than Irish employees ($\beta = -.16, p < .001$), and normative commitment ($\beta = -.11, p < .05$) thus providing support for Hypotheses 1 & 2. Hypothesis 3 proposed that collectivist Indians would exhibit a greater willingness to expend extra effort than individualistic Irish employees. A statistically significant negative beta ($\beta = -.11, p < 0.05$) for nationality in predicting extra effort supported hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 4 proposed that collectivist Indians should report a greater intention to stay with the organization than individualistic Irish. Contrary to our expectations, the Indian employees displayed a significantly lower level of 'tenure intent' than Irish employees ($\beta = .12, p < .01$) thus negating hypothesis 4.

Hypotheses 1(a), 2(a), 3(a) & 4(a) proposed that employees' individualism orientations would be negatively related to the two forms of commitment, extra effort and tenure intent. In the regression predicting affective commitment, self-reliance dimension of I/C was negatively related to affective commitment ($\beta = -.19, p < .001$), normative commitment ($\beta = -.12, p < .01$) and tenure intent ($\beta = -.19, p < 0.001$) thus supporting H1(a), H2(a), and H4(a). Self-reliance dimension of I/C was unrelated to extra effort.

Contrary to expectations, the competitive dimension of I/C was positively related to affective commitment ($\beta = .08, p < 0.05$), normative commitment ($\beta = .10, p < .05$) and extra effort ($\beta = .16, p < .001$) thus negating the hypothesis. However, with tenure intent as the

dependent variable, the beta for the competitiveness dimension of I/C was negative and significant ($\beta = -.12, p < 0.01$) in support of H4(a).

With respect to the supremacy of individual goals dimension's relationships with the outcome variables, only hypothesis 3(a) was supported with the supremacy of individual goals having a negative relationship with extra effort ($\beta = .10, p < .05$). That is, individuals with a higher individualism oriented on individual goals tended to expend lesser effort. With respect to the hypothesized effects of solitary work preference dimension of I/C, solitary work preference was negatively related to normative commitment ($\beta = .06, p < 0.10$) and extra effort ($\beta = .06, p < 0.10$) but the statistical significance was marginal yet in the expected direction.

In summary, the results were generally supportive of the hypotheses with the Indians exhibiting greater affective commitment, normative commitment, and willingness to expend extra effort on the job than Irish; Irish, however, reported higher levels of tenure intent than Indians, contrary to expectations. Except the effects of competitiveness dimension of I/C on the two forms of commitment (normative and affective) and extra effort, the rest of the results were again generally supportive of the effects of I/C orientation on the outcome variables.

DISCUSSION

In this study, under the assumption that Indians were more collectivist than Irish and I/C orientations vary within a culture, we examined the effects of I/C orientations on four come variables: affective commitment, normative commitment, extra effort, and tenure intent. Of the four dimensions included in this study, Indians exhibited more collectivism on supremacy of individual goals and solitary work preferences. These dimensions were labeled as vertical collectivism and horizontal collectivism by Triandis et al., (1998). Of the other two dimensions, self-reliance dimension did not yield any significant differences and Indians were more individualistic on the competitiveness dimension. Triandis et al., refer to the competitiveness dimension as vertical individualism and the self-reliance dimension as horizontal individualism. Thus, future studies should not presume and use nationality as a surrogate for culture but must attempt to measure the cultural level variables to validate our assumptions about our cultures.

In support of our hypotheses, we found that Indians employees tended to exhibit a greater level of affective and normative commitments and were willing to expend extra effort on the job than the Irish employees. Thus, at the cultural level, there does seem to be clear differences in employee attitudes towards their job and the organization. Consistent with the collectivist nature of Indian culture compared to the Irish culture, Indian employees tend to be more committed to their organization and be willing to put in extra effort for the benefit of their organization. However, we also found that the Indian employees showed a significantly lower level of intent to stay with the current organization compared with the Irish employees that was somewhat surprising. The recent liberalization trends in the Indian economy and a dynamic labor market may have contributed to this unexpected finding. The Indian sample consisted of employees from several high-technology firms and the shortage of qualified employees in this sector may have created in them perceived external employment opportunities. Thus, they may have shown lesser inclination to stay with the firm longer. Future research should examine these findings with different samples.

At the individual level, the effect of I/C orientations on commitment, tenure intent, and extra effort were in the predicted directions. That is, individuals with greater individualistic values tended to exhibit lower commitment to their organizations, tended to have lower tenure intentions, and were likely to expend lesser effort on their job. The one dimension of I/C that contradicted our expectations was the competitiveness dimension. While we expected individuals with a higher level of competitiveness (individualistic values) to be less committed to their organization, they reported greater commitment to the organization and were willing to expend effort for the benefit of their organization. Yet, a higher competitiveness orientation results in lower intent to stay with the organization. Since the competitiveness dimension is a vertical dimension of I/C and emphasizes equity in exchange relationships (Triandis, et al., 1998), commitment to the organization may be perceived by these individuals as fulfillment of their part of the contractual obligations. In any case, we propose that future studies should look at the relationships between I/C and commitment with a different sample.

Positive employee attitudes towards their organizations are generally conducive to organizational successes or failures. In this sense, organizations doing businesses in India can perhaps expect more loyalty and commitment from their employees compared to individualistic cultures such as US or Ireland. This finding itself may not be surprising given the extensive research done on I/C. However, our study also found that individual differences on I/C predicted employee attitudes. Generally speaking, more individualistically oriented employees tended to exhibit less positive attitudes than collectivism oriented employees. Given the importance of teamwork, collaboration, and cooperation emphasized in today's workplace, organizations may not expect positive work attitudes from the individualistically oriented employees.

Our primary goal of the study was to examine if significant differences in employee attitudes existed among Irish and Indian employees, as well as, the effect of individual differences on the cultural variable of I/C on employee attitudes. We were less interested in the causal linkages between these variables. For example, several studies have shown a clear linkage between commitment and tenure intent (e.g., Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004). That is, organizational commitment was the strongest predictor of tenure intent. Future studies for example should examine if the strength of the relationship varied between individualistic and collectivistic cultures such as Ireland and India, respectively. Similarly, one could also hypothesize that commitment may also predict extra effort on the job although the strength of the relationships may vary between cultures. This is another avenue for potential future research. Also, with greater integration of the Indian society, both economically and culturally, we feel that the changes in values systems, cultural orientations and their impact on the work attitudes of employees is a fruitful and important area of research. It remains to be seen whether western HRM practices would be accepted and applicable in a collectivist culture like India and how it will have to be modified to suit the local conditions (Hofstede, 1992).

CONCLUSION

In the present study, we found significant differences in employee attitudes across cultures. Further, we also found that intra-cultural variations on I/C predicted employee attitudes. However, our study is not without limitations. First, we used a cross-sectional survey design with the concomitant issues related to response bias and social desirability problems. Although we do not see this to be a major issue, future studies should possibly

measure I/C and attitudes at different time periods to potentially eliminate response bias. Second, our sample may also be considered as a convenience sample since we could not compare more countries. Lack of funding for the research and our contacts being on sabbatical leave in different cultures preempted us from extending the study to more cultures. Future studies should examine these issues with more diverse sample drawn from different countries. Third, we should also possibly look at the effects of other cultural dimensions such as power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity-femininity dimensions on work attitudes. Overall, the present study provides a useful starting point for a potential avenue for research in cross-cultural arena.

TABLE 1**Results of the Independent Sample T-test on I/C orientations**

Variable	Mean Score for India	Mean Score for Ireland	t-statistic	p	Comments
Competitiveness	3.42	2.60	10.31	p < .001	Indians more individualistic than Irish
Self-Reliance	3.06	3.01	0.59	p > .05	No statistically significant difference.
Solitary Work Preferences	2.27	2.48	2.54	p < .05	Indians more collectivist than Irish.
Supremacy of Individual Goals	2.35	2.58	3.00	p < .01	Indians more collectivist than Irish.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations^a among the Variables

Variables	Mean (σ)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Age	30.13 (7.35)										
2. Gender	0.30 (0.46)	12*									
3. Self-Reliance	2.93 (0.88)	-24**	-05								
4. Competitiveness	2.80 (0.88)	-16*	-26***	43***							
5. Solitary Work Preference	2.62 (0.93)	-03	14*	18**	-15*						
6. Supremacy of individual interest	2.40 (0.75)	-05	-07	28***	27***	-11					
7. Supremacy of individual goals	3.59 (0.88)	-28***	15*	23***	03	00	04				
8. Preference for Equality	3.03 (0.83)	04	02	16*	07	02	17**	14*			
9. Preference for Progressive HRM Practices	4.05 (0.74)	09	04	02	-04	-14*	-18**	20**	24***		
10. Preference for Paternalistic HRM Practices	2.16 (0.74)	11	00	17*	10	06	39***	01	17*	-50***	
11. Preference for Fairness in Performance Appraisal and Rewards	3.54 (0.83)	-10	-04	09	10	-12*	03	18**	10	53***	-21**

^a decimals omitted

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Table 3

Results of the Hierarchical Regression Predicting Preferences for Human Resource Systems

Variables	Affective Commitment β (t-statistic)	Normative Commitment β (t-statistic)	Extra Effort β (t-statistic)	Tenure Intent β (t-statistic)
Step 1				
Nationality (India = 0; Ireland = 1)	-.16 (3.54)***	-.11 (2.33)*	-.11 (2.43)*	0.12 (2.63)**
ΔR^2	0.03	0.02	.04	.03
$F_{1,581}$	19.75***	12.60***	21.65***	17.33***
Step 2				
Self-Reliance	-.19 (4.12)***	-.12 (2.55)**	-.02 (0.34)	-.19 (4.08)***
Competitiveness	0.08 (1.83)*	0.10 (2.27)*	0.16 (3.52)***	-.12 (2.54)**
Supremacy of individual goals	0.02 (0.50)	0.03 (0.55)	-.10 (2.27)*	0.03 (0.67)
Solitary Work Preference	0.00 (0.01)	-.06 (1.30)†	-.06 (1.42)†	0.04 (0.84)
ΔR^2	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.05
$F_{4,577}$	5.24***	3.87***	4.64***	6.91***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ † $p < .10$

REFERENCES

- Allen, J. A., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Allen, N. & Meyer, J. (1996) Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of the construct validity, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- Berman, J. J., Murphy-Berman, V., & Singh, P. (1985) Cross-cultural similarities and differences in perception of fairness. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16, 55-67.
- Brown, R. B. (1996) Organizational commitment: Clarifying the concept and simplifying the existing construct typology, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 230-251.
- Budhwar, P. & Khatri, N. (2001) A comparative study of HR practices in Britain and India, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(5), 800-826.
- Budhwar, P. & Sparrow, P. (1997) Evaluating level of strategic integration and development of human resource management in India, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(4), 476-494.
- Budhwar, P. & Sparrow, P. (2002) Strategic HRM through the cultural looking glass: Mapping the cognition of British and Indian managers, *Organization Studies*, 23(4), 599-638.
- Burnham, J. (2003) Why Ireland boomed?, *The Independent Review: A Journal of Political Economy*, 7(4), 537-556.
- Clugston, M., Howell, J. and Dorfman, P. (2000) Does cultural specialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment?, *Journal of Management*, 26(1), 5-30.
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R., & Welbourne, T. (1991) Compensation strategies in a global context. *Human Resource Planning*, 14, 29-41.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1984) Cultural dimensions in management and planning, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 1, 81-99.
- Hofstede, G. (1992) Cultural constraints in management theories, Paper presented at the *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1994) A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Towards a new formulation, in U. Kim, H. C. Tiranidis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (eds), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, method and application*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991) A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment, *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997) *Commitment in the workplace*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moorman, R. & Blakely, G. (1995) Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 127-142.
- Moorman, R. (1991) Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979) The measure of organizational commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 14, 224-247.
- O'Malley, E., & Gorman, C. (2001) Competitive advantage in the Irish indigenous software industry and the role of inward foreign direct investment, *European Planning Studies*, 9(3), 303-321.
- Organ, D. (1988) *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. (1997) Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time, *Human performance*, 10, 85-97.
- Parkes, L. P., Bochner, S. & Schneider, S. K. (2001) Person-organization fit across cultures: An empirical investigation of individualism and collectivism, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(1), 81-108.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, R. T. (1974) Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Probst, T. M., Carnevale, P. J., & Triandis, H. C. (1999) Cultural values in intergroup and single group social dilemmas, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 171-91
- Ramamoorthy, N. & Carroll, S. (1998) Individualism-collectivism orientations and reactions towards alternative human resource management practices, *Human Relations*, 51, 571-588.
- Ramamoorthy, N. & Flood, P. (2002) Employee attitudes and behavioral intentions: A test of the main and moderating effects of individualism-collectivism orientations, *Human Relations*, 55, 1071-1096.
- Schuler, R.S., Budhwar, P.S., & Florkowski, G.W. (2002). International human resource management: Review and critique. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 4:1, 41-70.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994) Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values, in U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (eds), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, method and application*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sosik, J. & Jung, I. (2001) Workgroup characteristics and performance in collectivistic and individualistic cultures, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(1), 5-23.

Triandis, H. C. (1989) Cross-cultural studies of individualism-collectivism, In J. J. Berman (Ed.) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Vol 37, 41-133, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1994) Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism, in U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (eds), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, method and application*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

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

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C. & Hui, H. C. (1990) Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1006-1020.

Wagner, J. (1995) Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects of cooperation in groups, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 152-172.