

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227417852>

Individualism–collectivism orientation and employee attitudes: A comparison of employees from the high–technology sector in India...

Article in *Journal of International Management* · June 2005

DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2147356 · Source: RePEc

CITATIONS

34

READS

380

4 authors, including:



[Nagarajan Ramamoorthy](#)

University of Houston – Victoria

30 PUBLICATIONS 730 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Subodh Kulkarni](#)

Howard University

17 PUBLICATIONS 142 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Patrick C. Flood](#)

Dublin City University

84 PUBLICATIONS 1,478 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Leading across the intergenerational divide [View project](#)



Knowledge Intensive Firms in the UK and Ireland [View project](#)



ELSEVIER

Journal of International Management 13 (2007) 187–203

THE FOX SCHOOL
of Business and Management
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Individualism–collectivism orientation and employee attitudes: A comparison of employees from the high-technology sector in India and Ireland [☆]

Nagarajan Ramamoorthy ^{a,*}, Subodh P. Kulkarni ^{b,1},
Amit Gupta ^{c,2}, Patrick C. Flood ^{d,3}

^a *University of Houston-Victoria, 14000 University Boulevard, Sugar Land, TX 77479, USA*

^b *School of Business, Howard University, 2600 Sixth Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20059, USA*

^c *Indian Institute of Management-Bangalore, Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore 560 076, India*

^d *Department of Personnel and Employment Relations, University of Limerick, National Technological Park, Plassey, Limerick, Ireland*

Received 22 August 2005; received in revised form 15 September 2006; accepted 7 November 2006

Available online 23 April 2007

Abstract

In this study, we examined the effects of individualism–collectivism (I/C) orientations on organizational commitment (affective and normative), tenure intent, and willingness to expend effort among Indian and Irish employees. Results indicated that Indians exhibited higher willingness to expend effort, affective and normative commitments than the Irish employees. Irish employees, however, reported higher tenure intent than Indians. The self-reliance dimension of I/C predicted commitment and tenure intent in the hypothesized direction. The competitiveness dimension of I/C predicted tenure intent in the hypothesized direction but predicted commitments and effort opposite to the hypothesized direction. Supremacy of individual goals dimension of I/C predicted effort and solitary work preference

[☆] The authors would like to thank the partial research grant provided by the University of Houston-Victoria, the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments in the revision of the manuscript and Denis Daly for helping with data collection in Ireland.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 281 275 3381.

E-mail addresses: ramamoorthyn@uhv.edu (N. Ramamoorthy), skulkarni@howard.edu (S.P. Kulkarni), amitg@iimb.ernet.in (A. Gupta), Patrick.flood@ul.ie (P.C. Flood).

¹ Tel.: +1 202 806 1539.

² Tel.: +91 80 6993322.

³ Tel.: +353 61 202929.

1075-4253/\$ - see front matter © 2007 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

doi:10.1016/j.intman.2006.11.002

dimension of I/C predicted effort and normative commitment in the expected directions. Implications are discussed.

© 2007 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Individualism; Collectivism; India; Ireland; Organizational commitment; Tenure intent; Effort; Employee attitudes; Work attitudes

1. Introduction

Since Hofstede's (1980) work on national cultures, the role of individualistic versus collectivist values in influencing the work attitudes of employees has been studied extensively. While Hofstede (1980, 1984) proposed that individualism–collectivism (I/C) is a uni-dimensional, bipolar cultural value, subsequent studies (e.g., Parkes et al., 2001; Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002; Wagner, 1995) have treated I/C as a multi-dimensional individual difference variable and examined their effects on employee attitudes such as commitment, tenure intent, loyalty, pro-social behavior, etc. Consistent with the suggestions of Hofstede (1992) that management practices differ across cultures, several studies have examined the fit between I/C values of individual employees and their work values both cross-culturally (e.g., Parkes et al., 2001) and at the individual level (Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998). The work attitudes that I/C orientations seem to affect include team loyalty, pro-social behaviors, attitudes towards a variety of HRM practices such as performance appraisal, reward systems, staffing practices, cooperation, effort, commitment, and tenure intent (Clugston et al., 2000; Gomez-Mejia and Wellbourne, 1991; Moorman, 1991; Moorman and Blakely, 1995; Parkes et al., 2001; Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002; Ramamoorthy et al., 2005; Sosik and 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 et al., 2001; Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002). These studies also show that the multi-dimensional nature of I/C may manifest itself in terms of relative emphases placed on competitiveness versus cooperativeness, focus on individual versus group, equity versus equality, and independence versus interdependence. 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 and collectivist values of Indian employees as reported in prior research (Hofstede, 1980)? (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 individual difference variable consistent with prior research (Kagitcibasi, 1994; Schwartz, 1994; Triandis, 1995; Triandis et al., 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). Prior research shows that these attitudes are valued by organizations and may impact a variety of organizational outcomes such as absenteeism, turnover, teamwork and productivity.

Our study should be of considerable interest to researchers and 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 and Meyer, 1996; Clugston et al., 2000; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Milkovich and Newman, 2005). 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. Third, the comparison of cultural influences among Indian and Irish employees may be timely because both India and Ireland have liberalized their economies, have attracted a high volume of foreign direct investment particularly in the high-technology sector and have seen a change in the management practices as a result ([Budhwar and Khatri, 2001](#); [Budhwar and Sparrow, 1997](#); [Burnham, 2003](#); [O'Malley and Gorman, 2001](#)). Ireland and India share certain similar characteristics such as a population growth of 1.40% and 1.16%, relatively younger workforce with median ages of 32 and 25, an emphasis on service sector with the service sector contributing 50.6% and 49% of the GDP, service sector employment of 50.6% and 63%, and a GDP growth rate of 6.9%, and 5.1%, respectively. Finally, the Indian national culture shows a relatively stronger emphasis on collectivism, whereas the Irish culture is more individualistic ([Berman et al., 1985](#); [Hofstede, 1980](#)). In [Hofstede's \(1980\)](#) study, Ireland ranked in the twelfth place on individualism with an index of 70 and India ranked in the twenty-first place on individualism with an index of 48 with a higher rank indicating a higher level of individualism. Thus, our study may provide some insight into cross-cultural differences in the value systems and the resultant 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 will discuss the methodology used to test these hypotheses. The third section presents the results of our study. Finally we will discuss the implications of our study and suggest directions for future research in this area.

2. Review of the literature

2.1. Nature of individualism–collectivism (I/C) and employment relationships

[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 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 to 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 goals 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 and Carroll, 1998](#)).

In individualistic societies, the relationship between an employee and the organization is considered to be contractual or agency in nature. 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 their employer ([Gomez-Mejia and Wellbourne, 1991](#); [Parkes et al., 2001](#)). In collectivist

societies, commitment to the organization and loyalty are expected from employees. In return for giving up one's individual goals and rights, organizations in collectivist societies are expected to take care of the employees beyond the obligations prescribed under the formal contracts. Further, organizations tend to emphasize job security to employees and employees, in return, also are expected to stay with the organization for longer periods including life-time employment. Paternalistic values espoused by organizations and their managers are still prevalent in collectivist societies such as India (Sinha, 1995). Further, prior studies (Gomez-Mejia and Wellbourne, 1991; Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Ramamoorthy et al., 2005) also indicate that I/C orientations predict different reactions to different management practices. Specifically, these studies show that individualistic values were related positively to equitable reward systems, formal appraisal systems, job-based hiring and merit-based promotions. On the contrary, collectivist values tended to be related to equality-based rewards, informal appraisals, hiring on the basis of person–organization fit, and seniority-based promotions that may value loyalty to the organization. Further, these studies showed that differences existed both at the individual level (I/C as an individual difference variable) and at the cultural level (nationality differences).

3. I/C and organizational commitment

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). Organizational commitment has also been shown to affect important organizational outcomes such as attitudes towards work, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, job involvement and career commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Meyer and Allen, 1997). Further, organizational commitment appears to be multi-dimensional construct comprising of behavioral and attitudinal dimensions (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Brown, 1996). Meyer and Allen (1991) have proposed a three-component view of organizational commitment comprising of affective, continuance and normative commitments, which have been classified as attitudinal commitment by Brown (1996). While affective commitment refers an employee's identification with and emotional attachment to the organization, normative commitment refers to the personal loyalty and moral obligations towards the organization. Continuance commitment, on the other hand, is associated with the investments that the employee makes in staying with the organization that increases the costs associated with leaving the organization. These three dimensions have been found to be conceptually distinct and distinguishable from each other (Allen and Meyer, 1996).⁴

Studies on the relationship between I/C and commitment have shown mixed results. For instance, a review of studies on collectivism and commitment (Randall, 1993) indicated that these two variables were unrelated. However, Parkes et al. (2001) found support for the hypotheses that collectivism was positively related to commitment. Similarly, Clugston et al. (2000) also reported that collectivists tended to exhibit greater commitment to the group than individualists. Theoretically, however, one should expect a positive relationship between collectivism and commitment since collectivism espouses trust, loyalty, and commitment (Kao and Sek Hong, 1993). Also, the nature of the relationship between an individual and his/her organization in collectivist cultures tends to be based on moral grounds than on contractual grounds. That is, in collectivist societies an organization tends to act as part of an extended family and the

⁴ Although we measured the respondents' continuance commitment in this study, we could not test its relationship with I/C due to low reliability exhibited by the scale.

organization is expected to take care of the employee and his/her needs beyond the formal employment contract ([Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998](#)). In return, employees are expected to show loyalty and commitment to the organization and generally tend to stay with the organization for a longer period of time including life-time employment relationships. Hence, based on prior research (e.g., [Hofstede, 1980](#); [Sinha et al., 2001](#); [Triandis, 1995](#); [Verma, 1999](#); [Verma and Triandis, 1998](#)) suggesting that Indians tend to be more collectivist than Irish, we propose that Indians will exhibit greater commitment to the organization than Irish. Further, Indians will also exhibit personal loyalty and moral obligations to the organization to a greater extent (normative commitment) than Irish. Further, controlling for nationality differences, individualists will likely exhibit lesser identification with the organization and be less loyal to the organization. In light of this, we propose the following hypotheses:

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.

4. 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 refers to the tendency of employees 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](#); [Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002](#)). 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 formal job description or a formal employment contract and organizations generally tend to hire employees that fit with the organizational values than merely focusing on the person–job fit ([Parkes et al., 2001](#); [Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998](#)). Organizations in collectivist societies may expect their employees to put in effort beyond their formal job roles and responsibilities since there may be a higher level of identification between the employees' goals and organizational goals. Cooperating with other employees in his/her organizations and helping other employees who may need assistance with their work are emphasized in collectivist societies. Such behaviors may benefit the organization and its goal attainment even when it may not be of direct benefit to an individual or form part of an employee's formal job description.

On the other hand, organizations in individualistic societies emphasize employment relationships based on agency models and thus are generally constrained by the formal contracts emphasizing *quid pro quo* relationships between the organization and the employee. Specific job descriptions focused on individuals tend to characterize employment relationships in individualistic societies. Organizations also tend to hire employees who may be best fit to perform the job as specified in the job description and may thus fulfill their part of the contractual obligations. Unless specified in contractual terms and/or the description of the job, cooperation with other employees or putting in

extra effort beyond the scope of the contractual terms are neither expected nor rewarded or punished. Since such extra role behaviors of extra effort or pro-social behavior are neither rewarded nor punished, an emphasis on individual goals rather than organization's goals, may result in employees not engaging in pro-social behaviors or expending effort beyond their normal call of duties. Prior studies (Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002, 2004) have also shown that at the individual level, I/C orientations were related to extra effort and pro-social behaviors. In light of these, we hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3. Indian employees should report higher levels of extra effort than Irish employees.

Hypothesis 3(a). A higher level of individualism orientation will be negatively related to extra effort.

5. Individualism–collectivism and employee tenure

Gomez-Mejia and Wellbourne (1991) suggest that collectivist orientations 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 employees from collectivist societies such as South-East Asia tended to be more committed to their organization and reported longer tenure with the organization than employees from individualistic societies. In collectivist cultures, job security and life-time employment are generally taken for granted compared to individualistic cultures. While organizations expect their employees to be committed and loyal to the organizations, organizations also tend to reciprocate such expectations through commitments of long-term employment and/or life-time employment (Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Gomez-Mejia and Wellbourne, 1991). In light of this, we propose the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 4. Indian employees should exhibit higher levels of tenure intent than Irish employees.

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

6. Method

6.1. Sample

We used a survey design to gather data from the participants. We collected data from six-hundred and eighty-six (686) professional and technical employees in Ireland and in India. Four-hundred and sixty-seven employees from several high-technology organizations in the Shannon region of Ireland participated in the study. Similarly, in India, two-hundred and nineteen (219) employees from several high-technology organizations in Bangalore completed the survey. Both of these regions are hosts to high-technology industries in their respective countries and hence provided us with comparable samples. Since the Indian sample had very good knowledge of English, we did not have any difficulty in obtaining responses to the survey instruments developed in English.

Of the Indian sample, 18 (14.1%) participants identified themselves as between the ages of 18 and 25, 107 (83.6%) identified themselves as between the ages of 26 and 35, and two participants (1.6%) identified themselves as between the ages of 36 and 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 and 25, 218 (46.7%) identified themselves as between the ages of 26 and 35, and 107 (22.9%) identified themselves as between the ages of 36 and 45, 21 participants (4.5%) identified themselves as between the ages of 46 and 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.

6.2. Measures

6.2.1. Affective commitment

We measured this construct using the [Mowday et al.'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 for the combined sample and was the same within each sample (Indian and Irish). Data coding was done in such a way that a higher score indicated a higher level of affective commitment. For the affective commitment scale, we chose the Mowday et al. scale than the Meyer and Allen scale because some studies (e.g., [Flood et al., 2001](#)) showed that the shorter form of the affective commitment scale of [Meyer and Allen \(1991\)](#) exhibited lower reliability than the Mowday et al. scale.

6.2.2. 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 0.77 for the combined sample with an alpha of 0.71 for the Indian sample and 0.79 for the Irish sample. Data coding was done in such a way that a higher score indicated a higher level of commitment.

6.2.3. Extra effort

We used [Ramamoorthy and 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 for the combined sample with an alpha of 0.66 for the Indian sample and 0.63 for the Irish sample. The data were coded such that a higher score indicated greater willingness to put in extra effort on the job.

6.2.4. 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.

6.3. Individualism–collectivism

We measured individualism–collectivism orientations using the twenty-items multi-dimensional I/C scale developed by [Wagner \(1995\)](#) and replicated by [Ramamoorthy and Carroll \(1998\)](#). Prior research has found this scale to be valid across different cultures such as the United States ([Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Wagner, 1995](#)), Ireland ([Ramamoorthy and Flood, 2002](#)) and India ([Ramamoorthy et al., 2005](#)). This scale measured five dimensions of I/C: competitiveness, self-reliance, supremacy of individual goals, supremacy of individual interests and solitary work preferences. We conducted a confirmatory factor analyses of the scale within each sample on a randomly chosen sample of two-hundred employees. The factor structures were similar across each sample suggesting that the constructs measured were equivalent across the two samples.

We computed Cronbach's alpha reliabilities on these five scales. The supremacy of individual interest scale consisting of four items exhibited a reliability of 0.48. Due to such low reliability, we dropped this scale from further analyses. Similarly, the self-reliance dimension of I/C exhibited an alpha of 0.55. However, dropping one item ("What happens to me is my own doing") from the self-reliance dimension scale increased the coefficient alpha to 0.62 and hence, a decision was made to drop this item from further analyses. Thus, we used the 15-items scale measuring four I/C dimensions for further analyses. Further, Cronbach's alpha for these four dimensions were computed within each of the two samples and found to be close to the alpha reliabilities for the combined sample. Appendix A gives the complete scale, factor loadings across the two samples, and their reliabilities.

6.4. Control variables

We used age and length of service as control variables in the tests of the various hypotheses. Thus, the effects of organizational tenure and age on the outcome variables are controlled for in testing the hypotheses. 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. Further, we conducted a one-way ANOVA with gender as the grouping variable including the missing data as a third group (male, female, and missing group) with the four I/C dimensions and the four outcome variables (two forms of commitment, tenure intent, and extra effort). The results did not show any significant difference on these eight dependent variables suggesting that the sample that failed to report their gender did not differ from those that reported their gender. Thus, the missing data do not seem to affect the results and hence, we decided not to control for gender to test our hypotheses.

6.5. Data analyses strategy

All of the hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regressions. Hypotheses 1–4 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 1–4. Hypotheses 1(a)–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)–4(a). In all, combining the four outcome variables and the five predictors (four I/C dimensions and nationality variable), twenty betas were tested for significance in support of the hypotheses used in this study. 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 one-tail *t*-tests. In the next section, we present the results of our study.

Since the Indian sample size was smaller than the Irish sample size, it is reasonable to assume that the Irish sample would exhibit a greater statistical power in the tests of the hypotheses. We performed a sensitivity analyses on a randomly chosen sample of four-hundred employees (two-hundred from each country) to rule out the effects of the sample sizes on the results. That is, we conducted the regression models and the tests of significance on the means on a randomly chosen sample of four-hundred employees, in addition to the regressions conducted on the total sample of six-hundred and eighty-six employees. The results indicated that the differences in means and the beta weights were only slightly different with a margin of $\pm .02$. Hence, we will be presenting the results of the analyses using the complete sample.

7. Results

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

As can be seen from Table 1, Indians were less individualistic than Irish on the supremacy of individual goals 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 the Irish. The self-reliance dimension of I/C did not yield any statistically significant difference between the Indian and Irish samples. Overall, Indians tended to be more collectivist on supremacy of individual goals and

Table 1
Results of the independent sample *t*-test on I/C orientations

Variable	Mean score for India	Mean score for Ireland	<i>t</i> -statistic	<i>p</i>	Comments
Competitiveness	3.23	2.60	10.31	$p < .001$	Indians more individualistic than Irish.
Self-reliance	3.14	3.01	0.59	$p > .05$	No statistically significant difference between Indians and Irish employees.
Solitary work preferences	2.33	2.48	2.54	$p < .05$	Indians more collectivist than Irish.
Supremacy of individual goals	2.40	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	2.02 (0.75)										
2. Length of service	7.83 (4.49)	0.30***									
3. Nationality	0.68 (0.47)	0.14*	0.67***								
4. Affective commitment	3.65 (0.84)	0.11*	-.06	-.18***							
5. Normative commitment	2.69 (0.90)	0.09*	-.09*	-.19***	0.51***						
6. Effort	2.97 (0.69)	0.05	-.05	-.17***	0.29***	0.27***					
7. Tenure intent	3.95 (1.85)	0.26***	0.26***	0.23***	0.46***	0.28***	0.06†				
8. Competitiveness	2.78 (0.76)	-.18***	-.34*	-.40***	0.10**	0.11**	0.15***	-.22***			
9. Self-reliance	3.05 (0.85)	-.06	-.04	-.02	-.16***	-.09**	-.03	-.20***	0.23***		
10. Solitary work preferences	2.43 (0.80)	-.06	0.01	0.09*	-.07*	-.10**	-.09**	-.01	0.03	0.31***	
11. Supremacy of individual goals	2.53 (0.78)	-.08*	-.01	0.11***	-.04†	-.02	-.13***	-.03	0.22***	0.31***	0.14***

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

^a Denotes one-tailed significance.

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. Notably, the correlations between nationality and affective commitment, normative commitment, and effort were negative and statistically significant suggesting that Irish employees reported lesser levels of effort, affective and normative commitments than Indian employees and were in the predicted direction. The nationality variable was significantly and positively correlated with tenure intent thus negating the hypothesis that Indians will exhibit greater level of tenure intent than Irish employees.

Of the sixteen correlations between the four dimensions of I/C and four outcome variables, nine correlations were statistically significant and in the predicted directions and four correlations were not statistically significant. The remaining three correlations (correlations of competitiveness dimension with the two forms of commitment and effort) were statistically significant but opposite to the hypothesized directions. Further, except for the correlation between solitary work preference and competitiveness dimensions of I/C, the remaining inter-correlations between the four I/C dimensions were positive and statistically significant.

Table 3 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analyses that tested the various hypotheses proposed in this study. Overall, of the twenty betas that were of significance to this study, eight betas were statistically significant at the conventional level of $p < .05$ and two were marginally significant ($p < .10$) and were in the predicted direction. Of the remaining betas, three betas were statistically significant at the conventional level of $p < .05$ and one beta was marginally significant ($p < .10$) but opposite to the hypothesized direction. The remaining betas were either not significant or marginally significant.

Table 3
Results of the hierarchical regression predicting employee attitudes

Variables	Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Extra effort	Tenure intent
	β (<i>t</i> -statistic)	β (<i>t</i> -statistic)	β (<i>t</i> -statistic)	β (<i>t</i> -statistic)
<i>Step 1</i>				
Age	0.13 (3.22)***	0.11 (2.78)**	0.06 (1.56)†	0.20 (5.13)***
Length of service	0.09 (1.73)†	0.04 (0.71)	0.09 (1.62)	0.12 (2.43)*
ΔR^2	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.11
$F_{2,685}$	6.83***	7.12***	2.38	39.67***
<i>Step 2</i>				
Nationality (India = 0; Ireland = 1)	-.23 (4.22)***	-.20 (3.67)***	-.15 (2.77)**	0.08 (1.49)†
ΔR^2	0.03	0.03	.03	.01
$F_{1,684}$	21.60***	18.00***	21.20***	7.56**
<i>Step 3</i>				
Self-reliance	-.21 (4.97)***	-.11 (2.61)**	-.01 (0.30)	-.19 (4.73)***
Competitiveness	0.11 (2.48)*	0.08 (1.90)*	0.16 (3.69)***	-.09 (2.10)*
Supremacy of individual goals	0.03 (0.67)	0.03 (0.83)	-.13 (3.12)***	0.05 (1.16)
Solitary work preference	0.01 (0.35)	-.05 (1.40)†	-.06 (1.47)†	0.05 (1.33)
ΔR^2	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.04
$F_{4,680}$	7.37***	3.50**	5.82***	7.68***

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

Hypotheses 1 and 2 suggest that collectivist Indians will display greater levels 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 ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$), and normative commitment ($\beta = -.20, p < .001$) thus providing support for Hypotheses 1 and 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 ($\beta = -.15, p < 0.01$) 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 lower level of tenure intent than Irish employees ($\beta = .08, p < .10$) thus negating Hypothesis 4.

Hypotheses 1(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 equations predicting the outcome variables, the self-reliance dimension of I/C was negatively related to affective commitment ($\beta = -.21, p < .001$), normative commitment ($\beta = -.11, p < .01$) and tenure intent ($\beta = -.19, p < 0.001$) thus supporting H1(a) H2(a) and H4(a). However, the self-reliance dimension of I/C was unrelated to extra effort. Thus, H3(a) was not supported.

Contrary to expectations, the competitiveness dimension of I/C was positively related to affective commitment ($\beta = .11, p < 0.05$), normative commitment ($\beta = .08, p < .05$) and extra effort ($\beta = .16, p < .001$) thus negating the hypotheses. However, with tenure intent as the dependent variable, the competitiveness dimension of I/C was negatively and significantly ($\beta = -.09, p < 0.01$) related to tenure intent thus supporting H4(a).

With respect to the supremacy of individual goals dimension of I/C only Hypothesis 3(a) was supported. The supremacy of individual goals showed a negative relationship with extra effort ($\beta = -.13, p < .001$). That is, individuals with a higher emphasis on individual, as opposed to collective, 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 extra effort ($\beta = -.06, p < 0.10$). Further, the solitary work preference was also negatively related to normative commitment ($\beta = -.06, p < 0.10$) but the level of significance was marginal. However, both of these relationships were in the predicted direction.

In summary, the results were partially 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. With the four I/C dimensions, the results were somewhat mixed. The self-reliance dimension of I/C supported the hypotheses but the effects of competitiveness dimension of I/C on the two forms of commitment (normative and affective) and extra effort were opposite to the hypothesized direction. The level of support obtained for the supremacy of individual goals and solitary work preference dimensions were somewhat weak.

8. Discussion

In this study, under the assumption that Indians were more collectivists than Irish and I/C orientations vary within a culture, we examined the effects of I/C orientations on four outcome 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. Of the other two dimensions, self-reliance

dimension did not yield any significant differences and Indians were more individualistic on the competitiveness dimension. Our study results indicate that the use of nationality as a surrogate for culture may be deficient in some sense. While prior studies (e.g., [Ramamoorthy et al., 2005](#)) indicated that Indians were more collectivist than Irish, the results of the present study indicated that this might not be the case always. Particularly, with respect to the competitiveness dimensions, Indians exhibited greater competitive tendencies than the Irish and were no less self-reliant than the Irish. Nearly three decades have passed since Hofstede's (1980) study results were reported. The economic liberalization, growth of foreign direct investments and the entrance of multinational corporations (MNCs) in India may have perhaps influenced a change in the value systems of the Indians. Competition for skilled labor from both domestic organizations and MNCs may have played a role in reinforcing competitive attitudes among the younger generations. Our results also seem to support the finding of [Sinha et al. \(2001\)](#) that in the Indian society, individualistic and collectivistic tendencies may co-exist. 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 cultures. Until then, our results should be interpreted with caution and considered tentative.

Our study also supported the hypotheses that work values may differ across cultures with Indians showing greater commitment to the organization and willingness to expend effort on the job than the Irish employees. Yet, Indians tended to exhibit lesser tenure intent than the Irish employees. This was somewhat unexpected in terms of our a priori expectations. Although both the Irish and Indian samples came from high-technology industries, certain macro-economic variables may be contributing to this unexpected finding. During the data collection period of 2003–2004, the Indian economy was surging but the Irish economy experienced a slow-down and an increase in the unemployment rate. Thus, it is quite feasible that non-availability of alternative jobs may have resulted in the Irish employees expressing a greater desire to stay with the organization despite a lower level of commitment. On the other hand, a tight labor market for skilled employees may have resulted in the Indian skilled labor having greater mobility options than the Irish employees and thus reporting lower levels of tenure intent. Whether the same tendency may exist in other sectors or during differing levels of unemployment levels needs to be explored in future research.

At the individual level, the effect of I/C orientations on commitment, tenure intent, and extra effort was 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. In any case, we propose that future studies should look at the relationships between I/C and commitment with a different sample.

While discussing the I/C orientations of various cultures, we should also point out some differences in the findings we obtained. Our sample in both countries came from the high-technology sectors. Also, the sample from both countries came from urban settings, namely, Bangalore and Shannon, both hosts to high-technology firms. Since the samples are from similar types of industries, the effects of the industry are controlled for thus ruling out alternative explanations to our findings. However, to what extent our findings may be

generalizable to other industries and sectors may itself be a worthy research avenue to pursue. Similarly, for the Indian sample, we chose Bangalore region as it is host to high-technology firms and very cosmopolitan. Hence, data collection through the administration of the questionnaire in English was not a difficult issue for us. However, to what extent the cultural patterns we found in this study among the Indian employees may be generalizable to other semi-urban, rural, and non-English speaking population is a question for future research.

From a practical perspective, 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 the 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. That is, not only cultural differences across cultures may influence work attitudes but variations in cultural values even within a culture may have desirable or undesirable consequences for the organization.

Finally, we could not test the effects of I/C orientations on continuance commitment. The scale that we used for measuring continuance commitment exhibited very low reliability. Future studies should also perhaps look at the effects of I/C orientations on continuance commitment. 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 are fruitful and important areas of research. It remains to be seen whether western HRM practices would be accepted and applicable in a collectivist culture like India and how they will have to be modified to suit the local conditions (Hofstede, 1992).

9. 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 is restricted to two cultures only. 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 samples 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. Finally, although India and Ireland exhibited similar macro-economic characteristics, we cannot totally rule out the effects of these variables on the work attitudes. Thus, separating the effects of economic and cultural variables on work attitudes itself may be a worthwhile pursuit for researchers. Overall, the present study provides a useful starting point for a potential avenue for research in the cross-cultural arena.

Appendix A. Individualism–collectivism scale: factor loadings and reliabilities

Item	Factor loading (India)	Factor loading (Ireland)
<i>I/C: Self-reliance</i>		
1. Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life	.76	.76
2. The only person you can count on is yourself	.73	.80
3. If you want to get something done, you got to do it yourself	.74	.56
Cronbach's alpha	.63	.62
<i>I/C: Solitary work preferences</i>		
1. I prefer to work with others than to work alone ^a	.86	.90
2. Given the choice, I would rather work alone than in a group	.76	.77
3. Working with a group is better than working alone ^a	.82	.88
Cronbach's alpha	.70	.74
<i>I/C: Competitiveness</i>		
1. Winning is everything	.84	.74
2. It annoys me when others perform better than I do	.48	.39
3. It is important to win	.76	.74
4. Winning is important in work and games	.71	.67
5. Success more important thing in life	.77	.71
Cronbach's alpha	.68	.67
<i>I/C: Supremacy of individual goals</i>		
1. Group is more productive when members follow their own interest	.69	.68
2. Group is more efficient when members do what they think is best rather than what the group wants them to do	.77	.77
3. Group more productive when members do what they want rather than what the group wants	.73	.85
Cronbach's alpha	.58	.61

^a These items were reverse coded to maintain consistent directionality such that a higher score on the scale indicates a higher level of individualism and a lower score indicates a higher level of collectivism.

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.
- Burnham, J., 2003. Why Ireland boomed? *The Independent Review: A Journal of Political Economy* 7 (4), 537–556.
- Clugston, M., Howell, J., Dorfman, P., 2000. Does cultural specialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management* 26 (1), 5–30.
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Wellbourne, 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*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- 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: Kim, U., Triandis, H.C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S., Yoon, G. (Eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, method and application*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Kao, H.S., Sek Hong, N., 1993. Organizational commitment: from trust to altruism at work. *Psychology and Developing Societies* 5 (1), 43–60.
- 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*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Milkovich, G.T., Newman, J.M., 2005. *Compensation*. McGraw-Hill-Irwin, NY, New York, USA.
- 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 Books, Lexington, MA.
- 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.
- Pedhazur, E.J., 1982. *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- 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, 171–191.
- 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.
- Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P., 2004. Individualism/collectivism, perceived task interdependence and teamwork attitudes among Irish blue-collar employees: a test of the main and moderating effects. *Human Relations* 57 (3), 347–366.
- Ramamoorthy, N., Gupta, A., Sardesai, R., Flood, P., 2005. Individualism/collectivism and attitudes towards human resource systems: a comparative study of American, Irish, and Indian MBA students. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 16 (5), 852–869.
- Randall, D.M., 1993. Cross-cultural research on organizational commitment. A review and application of Hofstede's value survey module. *Journal of Business Research* 26 (1), 91–110.
- Schwartz, S.H., 1994. Beyond individualism/collectivism: new cultural dimensions of values. In: Kim, U., Triandis, H.C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S., Yoon, G. (Eds.), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, method and application*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Sinha, J.B.P., 1995. *The Cultural Context of Leadership and Power*. Sage, New Delhi.
- Sinha, J.B.P., Sinha, T.N., Verma, J., Sinha, R.B.N., 2001. Collectivism coexisting with individualism: an Indian scenario. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 4, 133–145.
- 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., 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
- Triandis, H.C., McCusker, C., Hui, H.C., 1990. Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59, 1006–1020.
- Verma, J., 1999. Collectivism in the cultural perspective: the Indian scene. In: Lasry, J.C., Adair, J., Dion, K. (Eds.), *Latest contributions to cross-cultural psychology*. Swets and Zeitlinger, Lisse, The Netherlands.

Verma, J., Triandis, H.C., 1998. The measurement of collectivism in India. Paper presented at the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Bellingham, WA. August.

Wagner, J., 1995. Studies of individualism–collectivism: effects of cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal* 38, 152–172.