



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2003

The Relationship between Participation in Goal Setting, Company Size and Performance, Commitment, Acceptance and Job Satisfaction in the United States and Macedonia.

Kristin Michelle King
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

King, Kristin Michelle, "The Relationship between Participation in Goal Setting, Company Size and Performance, Commitment, Acceptance and Job Satisfaction in the United States and Macedonia." (2003). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 758.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/758>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

The Relationship Between Participation in Goal Setting, Company Size and Performance,
Commitment, Acceptance, and Job Satisfaction in the United States and Macedonia

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Psychology

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Psychology

by

Kristin Michelle King

May 2003

Dr. David Marx, Chair

Dr. Roger Bailey

Dr. Otto Zinser

Keywords: Participation in goal setting, culture

ABSTRACT

The Relationship Between Participation in Goal Setting, Company Size and Performance,

Commitment, Acceptance, and Job Satisfaction in the United States and Macedonia

by

Kristin Michelle King

While some researchers have suggested that participative goal setting increases performance, acceptance, commitment, and satisfaction, others have suggested that it does not. Additionally, much research on goal setting has been done in the US while none has been done in Macedonia.

The purpose of this study was to clarify the relationship between participation in goal setting and company size on these variables and to determine if there are differences in the effects of participation in goal setting in the US and Macedonia. The independent variables were country, company size, and type of participation and dependent variables were performance, commitment, acceptance, and satisfaction. Participants also completed Hofstede's (1994) VSM and demographic questions.

Workers from the US scored significantly higher on all dependent variables. There were no significant differences in participation versus assigned goal setting on the four dependent variables. Multiple regressions revealed that some VSM questions predicted the four dependent variables.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is impossible to acknowledge specifically every person who has given support throughout this research; I can only say thank you.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. David Marx, Chairman of my thesis committee, for his time, guidance, and encouragement. Appreciation is extended to the other committee members, Dr. Roger Bailey and Dr. Otto Zinser for their assistance and valuable contributions.

I am indebted to Borce Lazarov and his family in Macedonia for their time and efforts, for without them I would have never been able to conduct this study. I also sincerely thank my family for their unyielding support and guidance. I also thank the participating employers and employees for their time.

Finally, but most importantly, I thank God, from whom all things are made possible.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	7
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	8
Goal Setting Theory	9
Performance	9
Goal Commitment	11
Goal Acceptance	12
Job Satisfaction	15
Goal Setting and Culture	16
Culture	17
Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions	17
Power Distance	17
United States and Yugoslavia	18
Company Size	20
Uncertainty Avoidance	20
Individualism	21
Goal Setting Theory and Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions	22
Summary	26

2. METHOD	30
Participants	30
Independent Variables	32
Dependent Variables	34
Value Survey Module	34
The Packet	36
Reliability Study	37
Procedure.	37
Experimental Design	38
3. RESULTS.	40
Hypothesis 1	41
Hypothesis 2	41
Hypothesis 3	41
Hypothesis 4	41
Hypothesis 5	42
Hypothesis 6	42
Correlations	47
Hofstede's (1994) VSM	48
4. DISCUSSION.	51
Hypothesis 1	51
Hypothesis 2	52
Hypothesis 3	52
Hypothesis 4	53

Hypothesis 5	54
Hypothesis 6	55
Limitations and Criticisms	58
Future Directions	60
REFERENCES	62
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Experimental Packets.	67
Appendix B: Hofstede’s Value Survey Module	79
Appendix C: Copyright Permission for use of the Value Survey Module	89
Appendix D: Demographic Questions	90
VITA	92

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

1. Age Distribution of Participants from the United States and Macedonia	31
2. Education Distribution of Participants from the United States and Macedonia	32
3. Perception of a Large and Small Company	33
4. MANOVA Results for Levels of Performance, Goal Commitment, Goal Acceptance, and Job Satisfaction as a Function of Country.	40
5. Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Performance, Goal Commitment, Goal Acceptance, and Job Satisfaction as a Function of Country	41
6. The Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Predictors for Performance	43
7. The Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Predictors for Goal Commitment	44
8. The Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Predictors for Goal Acceptance	46
9. The Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Predictors for Job Satisfaction	47
10. VSM Questions Used to Calculate Individualism, Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance	49
11. Loadings on New Factors Using the VSM Questions	50
12. Relationship Between VSM Questions and New Factors	58

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The motivation and empowerment of employees will determine the success of many organizations; therefore, motivation is a key issue facing human resources and management (Luthans, Stajkovic, Luthans, & Luthans, 1998). Motivation in the work environment has been described as a set of internal and external forces (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999) that affect an individual's willingness to exert high levels of effort towards organizational goals. The satisfaction of employee needs will also influence motivation. Two factors should, therefore, be considered when referring to motivation in the work environment. These factors are effort and needs. Effort is a measure of intensity and the level of employee motivation will determine how much effort is exerted. Motivation should also be viewed as a need satisfying process. Because an unsatisfied need creates tension, the individual is stimulated by internal drives to reduce the need in order to reduce the tension (Korman, 1977). Employers can contribute to the employees' need satisfying process through both extrinsic and intrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors include such things as work environment, job security, and pay while intrinsic factors include such things as enhanced levels of responsibility, achievement, and recognition (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959).

Motivation, however, is difficult to measure. Because of this, many researchers have attempted to develop motivation theories that may assist in the measurement of motivation. Some of these theories measure motivation through reported feelings and attitudes. For example, equity theory measures motivation through reported job satisfaction. Other theories, such as goal setting theory, measure motivation through overt behavior such as performance (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999).

Goal Setting Theory

In the late 1960's, Edwin Locke (1996) proposed that intentions to work toward a goal are a major source of work motivation. Locke suggested that goals tell an employee what needs to be done and how much effort will need to be expended (Robbins, 1997). Locke (1996) proposed goal setting theory, which suggests that specific goals increase performance and that difficult goals, when accepted, result in higher performance. Locke developed his theory after results from laboratory experiments, involving such tasks as brainstorming, addition, and assembling toys, revealed that those individuals who were assigned challenging goals performed better than those individuals assigned only moderately challenging or easy goals (Latham & Locke, 1984). Locke also found that those participants who were given specific, challenging goals out-performed those who were given vague goals such as "do your best" (Latham & Locke, 1984). He further suggested that difficult goals require greater commitment than easy goals (Locke, 1996).

Performance

Several studies (Latham & Locke; 1984; Yearta, Maitlis & Briner, 1995) support the necessity of setting specific goals if performance is to be improved. Locke suggested that goals should be specifically set by either "quantification" or "enumeration. "Quantification" refers to creating numeric goals such as increase production by 7%, and "enumeration" refers to the creation of a list of tasks to be accomplished. Latham and Locke (1984) found that setting specific goals for drivers of logging trucks led to increased performance. Prior to the experiment, drivers consistently under loaded their logging trucks. Eventually, drivers consistently increased truck capacity beyond 90%. Summarizing many other studies conducted by Latham and Locke (1984), setting specific goals is an effective way to increase performance.

Locke's (1996) goal setting theory also suggests the importance of setting difficult goals as this leads to the increased likelihood of goal achievement. However, Latham and Locke (1984) found that for difficult goals to lead to the achievement of goals, the goal must be attainable. In order for the goal to be attainable, the individual must have the knowledge and ability to accomplish the goal. Locke's theory further suggests that if the individual does not possess the ability nor the knowledge to complete the goal, performance will decline (Locke, 1996). A meta-analysis of motivation revealed that most studies support the notion that setting difficult but attainable goals leads to increased performance when the individual is committed to attaining the goal (Yearta et al., 1995).

Locke's (1996) goal setting theory also suggests that performance feedback increases the likelihood that a goal will be attained. Locke proposed that feedback does not have reinforcing properties, but that it does cause people to challenge themselves; and therefore, set even higher goals. Research consistently supports the importance of feedback. For example, Earley and Stubblebine (1989) found that workers' performance in the United States was positively related to feedback. Ambrose and Kulik (1999) also found a positive relationship between performance and feedback when studied in college students who were given the opportunity to participate in a stock market simulation. These students achieved higher levels of performance when a specific, difficult goal included feedback. Ambrose and Kulik postulated that two types of feedback seemed highly effective. These two types of feedback include process feedback and specific-outcomes-feedback. Process feedback reveals how to change behavior while specific outcomes feedback reveals why change may be necessary.

According to Parnell and Bell (1994) employee participation in decision-making includes "any process that results in some degree of transfer of decision control and responsibility from a

superior to his or her subordinates” (p.521). Participation in setting work goals falls within this definition because an employee’s determination of work goals is a “transfer of decision control and responsibility from a superior to his or her subordinates” (p.521). Some researchers have concluded that participation in goal setting will lead to increased performance. However, there is conflicting evidence on the motivational value of participation in goal setting. For example, Locke (1996) suggests that there is little difference between performance when goals are assigned and performance when goals are cooperatively set. However, Erez and Arad (1986) found that participation in goal setting increased performance. Latham and Yukl (1975) investigated the effects of participation in goal setting on performance. After dividing participants into three groups, “assigned”, “do your best”, and “participatively set” goals, those individuals in the participatory goal setting group performed better than those who were in the assigned work goals group. Levine (1990) suggests that allowing workers to participate in decision-making will increase productivity.

Goal Commitment

Locke’s (1996) goal setting theory includes intervening variables that affect performance. One of the most important intervening variables is goal commitment. Locke proposed that there is a need for commitment when goals are specific and difficult. He found that commitment to goal attainment could be increased in two ways. First, the individual must believe that the goal is important. Second, the individual must believe that the goal is attainable. Locke suggested that individuals could be convinced of the goal’s importance by providing the reasons for the necessity of goal attainment. He further suggested that a leader within the organization could influence employees to commit to the goal and that a leader could use various techniques to inspire goal commitment, such as expressing confidence in employees’ abilities, improving skills

through training, “providing and communicating an inspiring vision for the company or organization”, allowing for “ownership” of tasks, and “asking for commitment in public” (Locke, 1996, p. 218). Jurkiewicz (2000) has proposed that enhanced employee commitment will improve if management assigns challenging tasks. Through enhancing commitment, employees may become motivated to accomplish organizational goals.

A meta-analysis by Wofford, Goodwin, and Premack (1992) revealed that goal commitment was significantly related to goal achievement. According to Ambrose and Kulik (1999), self-set goals are often more effective in gaining commitment than assigned goals. Latham and Yukl (1975) concluded that participation affects performance to the degree that it leads to the establishment of, and commitment to, specific and difficult goals.

Participation in goal setting and participation in determining the process of goal attainment are relevant intervening variables that specifically relate to goal commitment. Several researchers (Hinze, Kalnbach & Lorentz, 1997; Locke, 1996) have suggested a strong relationship between participatory goal-setting and goal commitment. In other words, when individuals are given the opportunity to set their own work goals, goal commitment often occurs. According to Ambrose and Kulik (1999), self-set goals are often more effective than assigned goals at gaining commitment.

Goal Acceptance

Researchers have postulated that participation in goal setting leads to increased acceptance thereby increasing motivation to exert effort toward goals (Earley & Kanfer, 1985; Pearson, 1987). If performance is to occur, acceptance appears to be a crucial variable in goal setting because when acceptance is low, motivation will be low. However, acceptance can be increased by means of participation in goal setting, thereby increasing performance (Erez,

Earley, & Hulin, 1985). Latham and Yukl (1975) also suggested that the acceptance of goals and the motivation to attain them is greater when the workers are allowed to participate in the goal setting process.

Erez et al. (1985) investigated the impact of participation in goal setting on goal acceptance and performance in American college students. They hypothesized that the level of goal acceptance will increase as the degree of participation increases and that participation influences performance through its influence on acceptance. The study involved 120 male and female college students who worked on a simulated scheduling task. Participative, representative, and assigned goal setting groups either set personal goals or did not set personal goals. In the representative goal setting condition, a representative elected by the group negotiated with the experimenter in setting a goal. In the participative goal setting condition, participants were allowed to jointly determine their goals. In the assigned goal setting condition, participants were assigned a goal equal to the average of those set in the representative and participative conditions completed in a pilot study. The participants in the setting-of-personal goals condition were asked to write down their personal goals before the goal setting manipulation. In the no personal goal setting condition, participants did not write down their personal goals before setting goals. Each group was provided information as to the number of scheduling tasks that were completed in the pilot study by each group. The level of competition and goal difficulty was held constant across the goal-setting conditions. Perceived participation in goal setting and actual goal acceptance were assessed (Erez et al., 1985)

The results revealed that participative and representative goal setting significantly increased individual goal acceptance. Individual goal acceptance also significantly contributed to performance. However, when the variance of acceptance was removed, participative and

representative goal-setting groups did not significantly outperform assigned goal-setting groups. In contrast, previous literature yielded differences in the effectiveness of participative versus assigned goal setting. But the results of this study indicate that these inconsistent results may have occurred because of the variable of goal acceptance (Erez et al., 1985).

Erez and Earley (1987) investigated participation in goal setting and its effect on goal acceptance in a cross-cultural context. They used three types of goal setting. These included assigned, representative, and participatory goal setting. Participants included Israel-Kibbutz, Israel-urban, and Americans. All three groups participated in a “simulated scheduling task”. The highest acceptance level was obtained in the participatory condition and the lowest in the assigned goal condition. Acceptance in the participatory condition remained stable and did not even drop significantly for extremely difficult goals. The results from this study suggest that participation in goal setting increases acceptance, even when the goals are difficult. Within all three groups, participation had a significant effect on goal acceptance.

Many researchers have attempted to discover why goal-setting is effective. Specifically, Erez and Arad (1986) investigated the social, cognitive, and motivational factors that underlie the effects of participative goal setting. They found that when goals are participatively set in a group, performance levels increase. They, therefore, suggested that “sociopsychological group processes” increase the likelihood of goal accomplishment. In other words, the combination of both psychological and sociological factors will influence the effect of participation in goal setting on performance. They also found that goal acceptance and self-control are motivators that increase performance in quantity and quality.

Job Satisfaction

It has been suggested that when workers are given performance feedback, job satisfaction will significantly improve (Wilk & Redmon, 1998). In a study involving railway track maintenance work-gangs, Pearson (1987) revealed that participation in setting work goals significantly increased job satisfaction.

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959) directly relates to goal setting theory and job satisfaction. This theory suggests that when individuals are allowed to participate in goal setting, they will be more satisfied and therefore more motivated. Overall, this theory suggests that an individual's attitude toward his/her work will determine the individual's satisfaction or dissatisfaction. It further suggests that when an individual is satisfied with their work, they will be motivated to perform (Miskel & Keller, 1973).

Generally, most individuals consider satisfaction and dissatisfaction to be located on one dimension; in other words, it is commonly believed that the opposite of satisfaction is dissatisfaction. However, Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory proposes that within a work situation, two dimensions exist. It further suggests that because two dimensions exist, the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction, but that it is no satisfaction. This theory postulates that the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. It further suggests that there are several factors that lead to satisfaction. These factors are intrinsic and include, for example, achievement, recognition, advancement, and growth. Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory further suggests that there are several factors that can lead to dissatisfaction. These factors are called "hygiene factors". Hygiene factors are extrinsic and include, for example, issues dealing with security, status, relationship with subordinates, relationship with peers, salary, work

conditions, relationship with supervisor, supervision, and company policy and administration. Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory concludes that if an individual views the hygiene factors as "adequate", the individual will not be dissatisfied. If the individual views the "satisfiers" or "motivators" as adequate, the individual will be satisfied and motivated. Overall, this theory suggests that workers must feel as though the business success occurred because of their abilities (Herzberg et al., 1959).

Motivation-Hygiene theory has been linked to various theories that suggest the need for "self-actualization". "Motivators", such as achievement, recognition, advancement, and growth are thought to provide employees with the necessary tools to become self-actualized. It has been further suggested preventing an individual from being "self-actualized" will result in a decrease in motivation (Herzberg et al., 1959). Expanding on Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory, because participation in goal setting can be viewed as allowing the employee to be autonomous and facilitating employee growth towards their own creative and unique potential, it can be suggested that participation in goal setting is an effective way to increase job satisfaction.

Goal Setting and Culture

Although goal-setting theory is incorporated throughout many organizations, like many theories; it is "culture bound" (Robbins, 1997). Because the economy is becoming more globalized and American business is increasingly investing in countries around the world, it is important to understand what motivates people in other countries. Management theories have typically been developed with the use of American employees in American organizations or American college students in American universities. Cross-cultural researchers, such as Hofstede and Adler conclude that what is true for American workers in the U.S is not always true for workers in other countries (Welsh, Luthans, & Sommer, 1993).

Culture

Culture can be viewed as the “socially constructed meanings and preferences a group develops as it collectively negotiates environmental forces and the complexities of internal integration” (Geletkancyz, 1997, p. 616). As members of a particular culture, managers bring these “constructed meanings and preferences” to the work place. The attitudes and actions of managers directly reflect their culture (Geletkancyz, 1997).

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Hofstede (1984) suggests that there are four dimensions of culture that exist within countries. These dimensions include power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity. He suggests that individuals from countries that fall within a specific area on a cultural dimension are likely to exhibit behaviors and attitudes that are characteristic to that particular dimension. For example, a person from a country that is high in individualism is likely to be more concerned with his or her own goals than an individual from a culture that is characterized as being more collectivistic.

Power Distance

Power distance in a work setting refers to the degree colleagues fear to disagree with superiors, and with the type of decision-making subordinates prefer in their boss. It also refers to how comfortable employees are with unequally distributed power. Hofstede (1980) suggests that workers from countries that are high in power distance will prefer an authoritative manager or one that provides close supervision (Nasierowski & Mikula, 1998). In other words, workers will prefer a manager who makes decisions for them. In contrast, workers from a country that is low in power distance are more likely to prefer a participative manager. In other words, they will prefer a manager who allows them to participate in making decisions.

A great deal of research has supported the link between power distance and managerial decision-making. For example, Bochner and Hesketh (1994) revealed that managers from countries that were high in power distance used a “direct” style of supervision. Robert, Probst, Martocchio, Drasgow, and Lawler (2000) found that when power distance is high, negative attitudes toward participation result. Because participation in goal setting involves individual decision-making, workers from countries high in power distance will prefer a manager who assigns work goals. However, workers from countries low in power distance will prefer a manager who allows them to participate in goal setting.

United States and Yugoslavia. Hofstede’s (1980) research included several different countries including the United States and Yugoslavia. Until 1991, Macedonia was part of Yugoslavia as Yugoslavia consisted of six republics that include Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Slovenia, Croatia, and Macedonia. Macedonia, like several other former Yugoslav republics, is now an independent country. The map presented in Figure 1 illustrates the location of Macedonia within Eastern Europe.



Figure 1. Map of Eastern Europe, 2002, National Geographic

Although Yugoslavia was identified as being culturally opposite to the United States on all four dimensions of the Hofstede framework, power distance appears to be one of the most significant dimensions that affects the impact of employee participatory goal setting on performance because of its relationship to decision making.

Company Size. Hofstede (1980) further suggested that in smaller companies lower levels of power distance will exist; and that in larger companies higher levels of power distance will exist. This is because smaller companies tend to have a less centralized structure. With fewer employees, small company employees often have more responsibility and their jobs are enlarged relative to their counterparts in large companies. This results in a flatter organizational structure characteristic of relatively low levels of power distance. Because low levels of power distance tend to result in a worker's preference for a more consultative manager, it could be suggested that individuals who work in small companies will prefer participation in goal setting more than those individuals who work in large companies.

Uncertainty Avoidance

In a work situation, uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which employees feel threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and the extent to which they try to avoid them. The level of risk taking, employment stability, and stress determines levels of uncertainty avoidance. Nasierowski and Mikula (1998) suggest there is a positive relationship between avoidance of responsibility and uncertainty avoidance.

Hofstede (1980) also suggests that uncertainty avoidance is related to decision-making. Specifically, individual decisions are viewed as risky and individuals from a country high in uncertainty avoidance are not very willing to take risks. Individual decisions can specifically be related to participation in goal setting because workers are given the opportunity to make their

own decisions regarding work goals. It could, therefore, be suggested that workers from countries where uncertainty avoidance is high will view participation in goal setting as risky. It could also be suggested that workers from countries where uncertainty avoidance is low will be less likely to view participation in goal setting as risky and would favor it over being given assigned goals. Because Yugoslavia is ranked relatively higher than the United States in uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980), it could be suggested that workers from the United States will be more likely to prefer a participative manager than workers from Yugoslavia.

Individualism

Individualism describes the relationship between the individual and the collectivity that prevails in a given society. In some cultures, individualism is viewed positively, and is, therefore, a catalyst for competition and individuality. In other societies it is viewed negatively and is a source of alienation. Individualism and collectivism are measured on a continuum. Within companies, the location on this continuum is determined by the amount of loyalty devoted to the organization by the employees and the level of employee commitment to organizational norms. Within countries where individualism dominates, an employee's individual initiative is viewed positively. Within countries where collectivism dominates, an employee's individual initiative is viewed negatively, and group decisions predominate. This latter case is illustrated in countries such as Russia, China, and Brazil (Hofstede, 1980).

Schermerhorn and Bond (1997) suggest that in most countries individualism is associated with low power distance and that collectivism is associated with high power distance. In other words, in countries where such characteristics as individual initiative and competition are typical individuals will feel less comfortable with an unequal distribution of power in institutions and companies. In countries where group decisions are more typical and competition

is less intense individuals will feel more comfortable with an unequal distribution of power than their individualistic counterparts.

Researchers have suggested that individuals from countries that are low in power distance and collectivistic will have improved performance when allowed to participate in group goal setting (Hofstede, 1980). Because participation in goal setting often involves individual decision-making, those employees who live in countries where collectivism prevails may, therefore, view individual participation in goal setting negatively. However, those employees who live in countries where individualism prevails may view participation in goal setting positively because individual decisions are generally favored within individualistic cultures.

Levels of individualism not only vary among countries but also within countries. Vandello and Cohen (1999) found that patterns of individualism vary across the United States. For example, Mountain West and Great Plains states including Montana, Oregon, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, and Kansas tend to be more individualistic than deep southern states. States located in the deep south including Louisiana, South Carolina, Mississippi, Georgia, Texas, Arkansas, Virginia, Alabama, North Carolina, and Tennessee tend to be more collectivistic.

Goal Setting Theory and Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

Although a large amount of research has been done on goal setting and participation in the United States, a relatively small amount of theory building and research has been done on goal setting and participation in other countries, especially in the Eastern European countries. Motivation has been studied extensively on American workers but relatively little research has been done on workers from other countries. Culture is a critical variable to measure,

because often, when the cultural background of management and subordinates differ, motivation may be low (Globokar, 1996).

The cultural dimensions developed by Hofstede illustrate the differences between cultures and how cultural differences influence work behavior. Through his work, Hofstede established numerical values that represent a country's location on each dimension. According to the Hofstede framework, Yugoslavia is low in individualism, high in power distance, and high in uncertainty avoidance. The United States, however, is high in individualism, low in power distance, and low in uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980). More recently, Elenkov (1997) investigated these cultural dimensions within Russia and the United States. The results revealed that Russia is characterized by higher power distance and uncertainty avoidance in contrast to the United States. Like Macedonia, Russia is a Slavic nation and was previously a communist nation. It can be suggested that Russia and Macedonia might be culturally similar in many ways. In other words, like Russia, Macedonia may be higher in power distance and uncertainty avoidance than the United States.

Welsh et al. (1993) studied the impact of "U.S.-based participative techniques" on Russian factory workers when workers were given the opportunity to provide input on how to improve their area of responsibility. It was hypothesized that worker participation in decision-making would not have a positive effect on the performance of the Russian factory workers. With the amount of fabric produced being the dependent variable, researchers initially measured baseline production and then proceeded to integrate employee participation in decision-making. Following the integration of employee participation in decision-making, researchers again measured production. The hypothesis that participative decision-making would not have a positive effect on the performance of Russian factory workers was supported as the production of

fabric fell below baseline. Welsh et al. (1993) suggested that the decrease in performance was because of high levels of collectivism that led to a fear of being rejected by co-workers. It was also suggested that the workers feared that suggestions for improving performance would be misconstrued by their fellow co-workers as complaints.

Several variables influence the impact of participation in goal setting on performance. Welsh et al. (1993) suggested that the culture within the country has a dramatic effect on the impact of participation. This is because collectivism is associated with high levels of power distance. Because individuals from countries where high levels of power distance exist are more likely to accept the unequal distribution of power within institutions and organizations, they may also be more likely to accept being given assigned goals than their counterparts from countries that are low in power distance.

Erez and Earley (1987) investigated participation in goal setting and its effect on goal acceptance in a cross-cultural context. Participants included Israel-Kibbutz, Israel-urban, and Americans. The results suggested that the Israeli participants, who were classified as more collectivistic and lower in power distance, “reacted more adversely” to assigned goal setting as compared to the American participants. Relative to their goals, the Israeli performed better than the American participants in the participative goal setting conditions. Both the American and Israeli subjects had significantly lower acceptance for goals when the goals were assigned than when they were allowed to participate in goal setting.

As previously mentioned, deep southern states tend to be more collectivistic than midwestern states (Vandello & Cohen, 1999). Illustrating the influence of geographic location within the United States, Latham and Yukl (1975) compared the effects of participative and assigned goal setting on residents from North Carolina and the Oklahoma/Arkansas region.

Logging crews primarily from North Carolina and with an average educational level of 7.2 years were matched on previous production and randomly assigned to a participative, assigned, or generalized “do your best” goal setting conditions. The other sample included logging crews from the Oklahoma/ Arkansas region with an educational level ranging from 12-16 years who prior to the study had never set production goals. The supervisors in the assigned goal-setting groups gave a specific hard goal to the logging crews without consulting their employees for advice

Latham and Yukl (1975) found that the group from North Carolina performed better in the participative goal-setting condition than in the assigned or “do your best” condition. In this group, they set their goals much higher than those goals in the assigned goal setting condition. Goal attainment also occurred significantly more often in the participative goal-setting condition than in the assigned goal-setting condition for this group. There was no significant difference in performance, goal difficulty, and frequency of goal attainment between the participative and assigned goal setting for the group from Oklahoma/Arkansas. The authors suggest that the failure of goal setting to improve the performance of the Oklahoma/Arkansas crew may have been due to their education level, or other demographic variables confounded with education, such as the difficulty of establishing a goal-setting program in the Oklahoma region (Latham & Yukl, 1975). Some researchers have suggested that elevated levels of collectivism are related to a preference for participation in decision-making (Haire, Ghiselli & Porter, 1966; Hofstede, 1980).

Pearson (1987) conducted a study to examine the effects of participative goal setting on performance and job satisfaction in Western Australia. Australia had scores similar to those in the United States on all four dimensions of the Hofstede framework (Hofstede, 1980). Pearson

hypothesized that participative goal setting would lead to increased performance and increased job satisfaction. The study involved 43 male railway workers who maintained a specific part of the railway system (Pearson, 1987).

Both control and experimental groups were established and individuals were randomly assigned to the groups. For 48 weeks, both the experimental and the control groups completed progress assessment questionnaires at intervals of six weeks. The experimental groups were introduced to participative goal setting where they participated in establishing their first work plan. Researchers allowed the experimental group to establish written work goals for the following 2 weeks (Pearson, 1987). Researchers further required that the experimental group assess their own progress in reaching their goals. After 2 weeks, the worker's company headquarters provided feedback regarding their progress in meeting their goals. During each second week, the experimental groups established new task goals for the following 2 weeks (Pearson, 1987).

The perceived levels of participation by both the experimental and control groups were assessed. Job satisfaction was also measured. Performance was measured in both the experimental and control groups by assessing both planned and total performance. It was revealed that those railway workers who participated in goal setting experienced greater job satisfaction than those who did not participate in goal setting. Those who engaged in participative goal setting completed more work and established higher goals (Pearson, 1987).

Summary

While some researchers have suggested that participative goal setting may increase performance, goal acceptance, goal commitment, and job satisfaction others have suggested that

participative goal setting has little effect on these variables. It is hoped that the present study will help clarify the effects of participation in goal setting.

Previous empirical evidence (e.g., Latham & Locke, 1984; Erez et al. 1985; Pearson, 1987) has revealed cultural differences in the effect of participative goal setting on performance. Although much research on goal setting has been done on American subjects, it is important to understand the effect of participative goal setting on performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction in other countries. Although some researchers have endeavored to reveal the impact of participative goal setting in other countries, there has been no research done on the impact of participative goal setting in Macedonia.

Although, researchers have analyzed worker behavior in Yugoslavia, Macedonia is no longer a part of Yugoslavia. In addition, Macedonia is undergoing many changes in its attempts to transition from socialism to capitalism and these changes may influence worker behavior. These changes include: a) a high unemployment rate exceeding unprecedented levels of 30% (State Statistical Office, 2002); b) the enforcement of few labor laws; c) societal pressures to implement capitalism; and d) workers' experiencing significant pressure from their supervisors to produce. Because of these changes workers are generally not given the opportunity to determine their own work goals as the needs of the company often supercede those of the employees (personal communication, September 15, 2001).

As Macedonia transitions from socialism to capitalism, it still remains dramatically different from the United States in its culture. During the early 1970s when Hofstede (1980) analyzed survey results from various countries including the United States and Yugoslavia, both countries revealed themselves to be polar opposites on the four cultural dimensions previously

discussed. However, since that time, no research has been conducted to study the differences between the two countries.

The proposed study investigated the effects of culture on the impact of participative goal setting on goal commitment, goal acceptance, satisfaction, and performance. Three goals were set in this study: 1) to determine the effects of participation in goal setting on goal acceptance, goal commitment, satisfaction, and performance; 2) to determine if there are differences in the effects of participation in goal setting in the United States and Macedonia; and 3) to clarify inconsistencies regarding effects of participation in goal setting on performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction since there are many inconsistencies in the previous literature regarding these effects.

From these goals, several hypotheses were selected:

1. Respondents from the United States will score significantly higher in performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction than respondents from Macedonia.
2. Respondents who hypothetically participate in goal setting will score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents who hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting.
3. Respondents who are instructed to imagine they are working in a small company will score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents who are instructed to imagine they are working in a large company.
4. Due to differences in power distance, when respondents from the United States hypothetically participate in goal setting, they will score significantly higher on the four

dependent variables than respondents from Macedonia who hypothetically participate in goal setting.

5. When respondents from Macedonia hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting, they will score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents from the United States who hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting.
6. Using multiple regression techniques, the predictor variables of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, age, education, and gender will increase predictive ability on the criterion variables of performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

A total of one hundred seventy-six individuals (64 male, 112 female) from two separate countries participated in this study. In addition, 4 participants were excluded; 2 for incomplete surveys and 2 because their national origin was not the United States or Macedonia. Of the 176 participants in this study 86 (48.9%) were American and 90 (51.1%) were Macedonian. The participants from the United States consisted of workers from three factories located in the southeast with an average size of 120 employees. These factories included: a) a variety meat manufacturer; b) a sausage manufacturer; and 3) an adhesive-tape manufacturer. Company “a” and “b” owners agreed to allow the survey to be administered to both first and second shift employees in groups during their break time. A 24-year-old male graduate student administered the survey to employees from factories “a” and “b. The Plant Manager from Company “c” agreed to allow both first and second shift employees to be administered the survey in groups at the beginning of their shift. A 25-year old female graduate student administered the survey to employees from factory “c”. The Macedonians consisted of workers from 11 textile factories, producing both work and casual clothing, with an average size of 200 employees located in the northeast portion of Macedonia. First shift employees from the Macedonian factories were administered the survey during their break. A 29-year old Macedonian male business owner administered the survey to all participants working in Macedonian factories. Factories in both the United States and Macedonia were selected out of convenience. The average age of the American participant was 36 years and 5 months and the average age of the Macedonian

participant was 27 years and 6 months. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of age for the participants from the United States and Macedonia.

Table 1. Age Distribution of Participants from the United States and Macedonia

Age	United States	Macedonia
Under 20	0	11
20-24	3	10
25-29	13	18
30-34	9	14
35-39	17	8
40-49	21	11
50-59	3	6
60 or over		0

Among the participants, 64 (35.8%) were male and 112 (63.6%) were female. Fifty-five (64%) of the participants from the United States were male and 31 (36%) were female. Eight (9%) of the participants from Macedonia were male and 81 (91%) of the participants were female. The average years of education for the American participants was 12 .6 years and the average years of education for the Macedonian participant was 14.1. Table 2 illustrates the distribution of education level for participants from the United States and participants from Macedonia.

Table 2. Education Distribution of Participants from the United States and Macedonia

Education	United States	Macedonia
10 years or less	6	7
11 years	3	0
12 years	47	2
13 years	7	10
14 years	13	52
15 years	4	1
16 year	4	7
17 years	1	2
18 years or over	1	7

Independent Variables

The effects of nationality, level of participation in goal setting, and company size on performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction was investigated. Nationality was defined as the national origin of an individual. Nationality was verified through the use of two demographic questions regarding nationality and nationality at birth. Only those participants whose response to these questions matched the location of the company in the scenario were used. Level of participation in goal setting was divided into two separate conditions: high and none/assigned. High level of participation in goal setting was defined as the employees being solely responsible for setting work goals. The assigned goal-setting group was defined as the employees having no responsibility for setting work goals, where the employer sets goals for them.

The levels of participation in goal setting were presented to the participants in the form of scenarios (Appendix A). Eight scenarios were developed. In each scenario, location of company, level of participation in goal setting, and company size were varied. To determine company size, government standards were considered. According to the United States

Department of Labor, a small business is classified as having 500 employees or fewer and a large company has more than 500 employees. The Macedonian Privatization Agency classifies a small business as employing fewer than 50 individuals, and a large business as employing over 250 individuals. Because the government standards were not specific enough for this study, a pilot study was conducted where students from a regional southeastern university were asked what they considered a large company to be and what they considered a small company to be (see Table 3).

Table 3. Perception of a Small and Large Company

Measures of Central Tendency	Company Size	
	Small	Large
Mean	211.294	3972.794
Median	100	1000
Mode	100	1000

The mode and median were identical for the small company (100) and the median and mode were identical for the large company (1000). However, it was believed by the author that the difference between 100 and 1000 was not large enough to create dramatically diverse levels of the independent variable. An estimate of the mean (4000) of the large company was used instead. Therefore, for the American participants, the small company was presented as having 100 employees and the large company was presented as having 4000 employees. Because Macedonia classifies a small business as having fewer than 50 employees, the number of employees perceived by university students to exist in a small company and a large company could not be used. However, the ratio between the number of employees in a small company and the number of employees in a large company (1:40) as believed by university students was used. In the European scenarios, the small company in Macedonia was presented as having 50

employees, while the large company in Macedonia was presented as having 250 employees. These figures coincide with the standards set by the Macedonian Privatization Agency.

Dependent Variables

Four questions followed each scenario (Appendix B). These questions were the dependent variables of performance, goal acceptance, goal commitment, and satisfaction. Performance was measured on a 7-point rating scale. The end anchors were: I anticipate this work situation would greatly lower my performance (1) and I anticipate this work situation would greatly increase my performance (7). Goal acceptance was measured on a 7-point rating scale. End anchors were: I would definitely not accept this goal setting policy (1) and I would definitely accept this goal setting policy (7). Goal commitment was measured on a 7-point rating scale. The end anchors were: I would definitely not be committed to these goals (1) and I would definitely be committed to these goals (7). Satisfaction was measured on a 7-point rating scale. End anchors were: I would not be very satisfied (1) and I would be very satisfied (7).

Value Survey Module

To increase the understanding of international differences in work values, Hofstede (1980) analyzed data from over 116,000 people from 66 different countries who were administered the HERMES “Attitude Survey Questionnaire”. Hofstede determined cultural dimensions first through theoretical reasoning and then through ecological correlational analysis. He indicated that theoretical reasoning held greater value than a factor analysis because “finding a strong factor just means that many variables are intercorrelated, not that they mean anything” (Hofstede, 1980 p.77). Once he determined the dimensions through theoretical reasoning and ecological correlational analysis, he used a factor analysis as a method for verifying the number of dimensions and reducing the number of questions. His first factor analysis revealed the

existence of four factors. He then decided to eliminate some questions that he reasoned were unrelated to what he called “value”. Upon reducing the number of questions, he conducted another factor analysis. This Factor analysis revealed three factors. These factors include what he called; 1) “Individualism-low Power Distance”; 2)“ Masculinity”; 3) “Uncertainty Avoidance”. However Hofstede concluded “in spite of the fact that Power Distance and Individualism load on the same factor, I shall continue treating them as two dimensions because they are conceptually distinct” (Hofstede, 1980, p.84).

This questionnaire was later slightly modified and called the Value Survey Module (VSM). Hofstede (1994) suggests that a country’s location on each of the cultural dimensions is determined by scores on a series of questions from the VSM. First, the average response for each question must be calculated. Second, the average score for each question is placed within the corresponding question number located in the parentheses of the equation. Third, the score for each dimension is then calculated by using the appropriate formula. The formula for uncertainty avoidance is: $+25m(13) + 20m(16) - 50m(18) - 15m(19) + 120$ (positive 25 multiplied by the mean of question 13, plus positive 20 multiplied by the mean of question 16, minus positive 15 multiplied by the mean of question 19, plus 120). The formula for power distance is: $-35m(03) + 35m(06) + 25m(14) - 20m(17) - 20$ (negative 35 multiplied by the mean of question 3, plus positive 35 multiplied by the mean of question 6, plus positive 25 multiplied by the mean of question 14, minus 20 multiplied by the mean of question 17, minus 20). The formula for individualism is: $-50m(01) + 30m(02) + 20m(04) - 25m(08) + 130$ (negative 50 multiplied by the mean of question 1, plus positive 30 multiplied by the mean of question 2, plus positive 20 multiplied by the mean of question 4, minus 25 multiplied by the mean of question 8, plus 130).

By analyzing the responses, Hofstede's (1994) VSM has been utilized to assess cultural dimensions in a variety of countries (Erez & Earley, 1987; Nasierowski, & Mikula, 1998; Robert et al., 2000; Todeva, 1999; Winch, Millar, & Clifton, 1997). For example, Nasierowski and Mikula (1998) used Hofstede's VSM to measure power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism within the eastern European country of Poland. Robert et al. (2000) used Hofstede's VSM to investigate the level of power distance and individualism in the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India. The present study used a revised version of Hofstede's (1994) VSM to measure power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism (see Appendix C). Copyright permission for this survey was granted by the Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation (see Appendix D).

The Packet

Demographic questions were presented at the end of the packet (see Appendix E). The demographic questions were about the participant's gender, age, education level, nationality, and nationality at birth. Presentation of the scenarios, the Value Survey Module, and demographic questions was made through the use of packets. Each packet consisted of a set of instructions, one scenario, four corresponding questions, Hofstede's (1994) Value Survey Module, and demographic questions. Eight forms of packets were created to correspond with country, level of participation in goal setting, and company size. Two language versions of the packet were used. Scenarios, questions measuring the dependent variables, Hofstede's (1994) VSM and demographic questions were translated by an individual fluent in both the written and spoken English and Macedonian. Two individuals who were native to Macedonia verified translation; one was fluent in written and spoken English and the other had minimal English speaking skills. Order of contents within each packet was uniform in that each scenario and corresponding the

questions were followed by the Value Survey Module, and the demographic questions. Packets were in a prearranged order. Subjects were randomly assigned to scenarios as they walked into the testing area in a random order.

Reliability Study

Because the reliability of these scenarios was unknown, a separate reliability study was conducted using only one scenario, the United States-small company-participation scenario. The participants were 11 female workers from a variety of professions ranging from secretarial to professional. The questionnaire was administered twice to the same subjects, with 12 days between administrations. In order to match the two questionnaires completed by each subject while maintaining anonymity, subjects were asked to write a 4-digit identification number on the questionnaires at both administrations. Pearson r correlation coefficients were computed and all four dependent variables had r -values above $+0.47$. Specifically, question 1 had an r value of $+0.71$; question 2 had an r value of $+0.47$; question 3 had an r value $+0.70$; and question 4 had an r value of $+0.61$.

Procedure

All American company managers introduced the researcher to the employees by telling them that the researcher was from East Tennessee State University and was working on a research project. All Macedonian company managers introduced the researcher to the employees by telling them that they were conducting research. Managers from both the American and Macedonian companies told the employees that access to the results would not be given to the employers. The manager then left the room and allowed the researcher to address the employees directly. The following statement was made to the participants in either English or Macedonian:

Hello, My name is _____. I am conducting a study and appreciate your participation. Your responses to these questions will remain completely anonymous. No one will know what your responses to these questions are, so please do not put your name on the packet. Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to do this. If at any time you wish to stop participation, you may do so. However, it is important that you fill out the questionnaire completely. I will now be passing out packets to each individual. Please follow the directions given throughout the packet. If you have any questions, please let me know.

The employers were not given the results of the questionnaire. The subjects were not debriefed as it was believed that debriefing may cause the employer to seek the results which in turn may influence the way the employees are treated in the future.

Experimental Design

The experimental design was a 2 X 2 X 2 between groups factorial with unequal cell sizes. The independent variables were nationality (2 levels: American and Macedonian), company size (2 levels: small and large), and level of participation in goal setting (2 levels: high and assigned/none). The factor of nationality was a demographic variable and company size was a stimulus variable. The levels of participation in goal setting were stimulus variables. The dependent variables were rated performance, acceptance, commitment, and satisfaction. Each dependent variable was measured on a 7-point rating scale. Overall, a MANOVA using the Roy-Bargman Stepdown Procedure was used to examine the results. The alpha level was set at $p \leq .05$. To determine if the dependent variables were related a correlation matrix was computed.

The predictor variables involving the independent variables, demographic variables, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and individualism were used in a multiple regression analysis to determine whether the predictability on the four criterion variables could be improved.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1

The hypothesis that respondents from the United States would score significantly higher in performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction than respondents from Macedonia was supported. The MANOVA results indicated a significant effect for country on performance $F(1, 165)=6.511, p<.05$, goal acceptance $F(1, 165)=4.616, p<.05$, and goal commitment $F(1, 165)=18.747, p<.001$. No significant results were indicated for job satisfaction, $F(1, 165)=2.434$ (See TABLE 4). Descriptive statistics are provided in Table 5.

Table 4. Manova Results for Levels of Performance, Goal Commitment, Goal Acceptance, and Job Satisfaction as a Function of Country

Variable	<u>df</u>	SS	MS	F
Performance	1	422.15	2.51	6.511*
Acceptance	1	468.95	2.79	4.615*
Commitment	1	397.48	2.35	18.746**
Satisfaction	1	572.70	3.41	2.434

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Performance, Commitment, Goal Acceptance, and Job Satisfaction as a Function of Country

Variable	Country			
	United States		Macedonia	
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd
Performance	4.51	1.55	3.87	1.58
Goal Commitment	5.15	1.43	3.83	1.61
Goal Acceptance	4.78	1.61	3.9	1.72
Job Satisfaction	4.39	1.78	3.59	1.88

Hypothesis 2

The hypothesis that respondents who hypothetically participated in goal setting will score significantly higher on performance, goal acceptance, goal commitment, and job satisfaction than respondents who hypothetically participated in assigned goal setting was not supported. The MANOVA results indicated non-significance for performance, $F(1, 165) = .743$, goal acceptance, $F(1, 165) = 1.951$, goal commitment, $F(1, 165) = .273$, and job satisfaction, $F(1, 165) = 1.412$.

Hypothesis 3

The hypothesis that respondents who are instructed to imagine that they were working in a small company will score significantly higher on performance, goal acceptance, goal commitment, and job satisfaction than respondents who were instructed to imagine they were working in a large company was not supported. The MANOVA results indicated non-significance for performance, $F(1, 165) = .010$, goal acceptance, $F(1, 165) = 1.458$, goal commitment, $F(1, 165) = .114$, and job satisfaction, $F(1, 165) = .105$.

Hypothesis 4

The hypothesis that respondents from the United States who hypothetically participate in goal setting will score significantly higher in performance, goal acceptance, goal commitment, and job satisfaction than respondents from Macedonia who hypothetically participate in goal

setting was not supported. The MANOVA results indicated non-significance for performance, $F(1,168)=1.047$, goal acceptance, $F(1, 167)=.027$, goal commitment, $F(1, 166)=1.310$, and job satisfaction, $F(1, 165)=.003$.

Hypothesis 5

The hypothesis that respondents from Macedonia who hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting, will score significantly higher in performance, goal acceptance, goal commitment, and job satisfaction than respondents from the United States who hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting was not supported. The MANOVA results indicated non-significance for performance, $F(1, 168)=1.047$, goal commitment, $F(1, 166)=1.310$, goal acceptance, $F(1, 167)=.026$, and job satisfaction, $F(1, 165)=.998$.

Hypothesis 6

The hypothesis that multiple regression techniques involving predictor variables of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, country, level of participation, company size, age, gender, and education will improve predictions on performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction was partially supported.

Because the calculation of dimension scores on Hofstede's (1994) instrument resulted in no variability and the measurements from power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism originated from a combination of the VSM questions, individual Value Survey Module questions were analyzed instead. After eliminating non-significant factors, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how well country, question 7, question 10, question 13, and question 14 predicted performance. The linear combination of predictors was significantly related to performance, $F(5, 170)=8.38$, $p<.001$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .45,

indicating that approximately 20% of the variance in performance can be accounted for by the linear combination of country, question 7, question 10, questions 13, and question 14.

Table 6 provides indices of the relative strength of individual predictors. Four of the correlations were negative and one of the correlations was positive. All of the predictors were significant ($p < .05$). Country accounted for 4% of the variance for performance. Question 7 accounted for 3% of the variance for performance. Question 10 accounted for 3% of the variance for performance. Question 13 accounted for less than 1% of the variance in performance. Question 14 accounted for 6 % of the variance in performance.

Table 6. The Bivariate and Partial Correlations for the Predictors of Performance

Predictors	Correlation between each predictor and performance	Correlation between each predictor and performance controlling for all other predictors
Country	-.20*	-.18*
Question 7	-.17***	-.27***
Question 10	.16**	.24**
Question 13	-.004*	.17*
Question 14	-.24***	-.33***

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Because the calculation of dimension scores on Hofstede’s instrument resulted in no variability and the measurements from power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism originated from a combination of the VSM questions, individual Value Survey Module questions were analyzed instead. After eliminating non-significant factors, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how well country, question 7, question 10, question 13, and question

14 predicted goal commitment. The linear combination of predictors was significantly related to goal commitment, $F(5, 170)=11.447, p<.001$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .50, indicating that approximately 25% of the variance in goal commitment can be accounted for by the linear combination of country, question 7, question 10, question 13, and question 14.

Table 7 provides indices of the relative strength of individual predictors. Three of the correlations were negative and two of the correlations were positive. All of the predictors were significant ($p < .05$). Country accounted for 7% of the variance in goal commitment. Question 7 accounted for 15% of the variance in goal commitment. Question 10 accounted for 4% of the variance in goal commitment. Question 13 accounted for less than 1% of the variance in goal commitment. Question 14 accounted for less than 1% of goal commitment. On the basis of these correlational analyses one can conclude that country is the strongest predictor by a significant amount.

Table 7. The Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Predictors for Goal Commitment

Predictors	Correlation between each predictor and goal commitment	Correlation between each predictor and goal commitment controlling for all other predictors
Country	-.40***	-.37***
Question 7	-.19***	-.24**
Question 10	.18***	.25***
Question 13	.06*	.17*
Question 14	-.07*	-.19*

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Because the calculation of dimension scores on Hofstede's (1980) instrument resulted in no variability and the measurements from power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and

individualism originated from a combination of the VSM questions, individual Value Survey Module questions were analyzed instead. After eliminating non-significant factors, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how well country, question 7, question 10, question 14, and question 20 predicted goal acceptance. The linear combination of predictors was significantly related to goal acceptance, $F(5, 170)=10.69, p<.001$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .49, indicating that approximately 24% of the variance in goal acceptance can be accounted for by the linear combination of country, question 7, question 10, question 14, and question 20.

Table 8 provides indices of the relative strength of individual predictors. Three of the correlations were negative and two of the correlations were positive. All of the predictors were significant ($p<.05$). Country accounted for 7% of the variance in goal acceptance. Question 7 accounted for 6% of the variance in goal acceptance. Question 10 accounted for 3% of the variance in goal acceptance. Question 14 accounted for 3% of the variance in goal acceptance. Question 20 accounted for less than 1% of the variance in goal acceptance.

Table 8. The Bivariate and Partial Correlations for Predictors of Goal Acceptance

Predictors	Correlation between each predictor and goal acceptance	Correlation between each predictor and goal acceptance controlling for all other predictors
Country	-.26***	-.25***
Question 7	-.24***	-.34***
Question 10	.18**	.29***
Question 14	-.17***	-.28***
Question 20	.005*	.18*

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Because the calculation of dimension scores on Hofstede's instrument resulted in no variability and the measurements from power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism originated from a combination of the VSM questions, individual Value Survey Module questions were analyzed instead. After eliminating non-significant factors, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how well country, question 5, question 7, question 13, and question 14 predicted job satisfaction. The linear combination of predictors was significantly related to goal acceptance, $F(5, 170) = 10.014, p < .001$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .48, indicating that approximately 23% of the variance in goal acceptance can be accounted for by the linear combination of country, question 5, question 7, question 13, and question 14.

Table 9 provides indices to indicate the relative strength of individual predictors. Four of the correlations were negative and 1 of the correlations was positive. All of the predictors were significant ($p < .05$). Country accounted for 5% of the variance in job satisfaction. Question 5 accounted for less than 1% of the variance in job satisfaction. Question 7 accounted for 10% of

the variance in job satisfaction. Question 13 accounted for 1% of the variance in job satisfaction. Question 14 accounted for less than 1% of the variance in job satisfaction.

Table 9 The Bivariate and Partial Correlations for Predictors of Job Satisfaction

Predictors	Correlation between each predictor and job satisfaction	Correlation between each predictor and job satisfaction controlling for all other predictors
Country	-.22*	-.16*
Question 5	-.06**	-.23**
Question 7	-.31***	-.39***
Question 13	.11***	.26***
Question 14	-.09***	-.26***

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$

Correlations

Correlation coefficients were computed among the 30 variables, including country, company size, level of participation in goal setting, gender, age, education, performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, job satisfaction, and questions 1-20 from the Value Survey Module. The results of the correlational analyses indicated that 49 of the 225 correlations were significant, $p \leq .01$ and were greater to or equal to .35. In general, the results suggest that individuals who score high in performance will also score high in goal commitment, ($p < .001$, $r = .64$) and job satisfaction ($p < .001$, $r = .57$). The results also suggest that individuals who score high in job satisfaction will also score high in goal commitment ($p < .001$, $r = .77$). Additionally, VSM questions 1-9 tended to be highly correlated.

Hofstede's (1994) VSM

Analyzing the above results from the multiple regression analysis, the impact of country was very understandable since the MANOVA already indicated that country was a significant independent variable. However, the question becomes why question 7, 10, 13, and 14 were such significant predictors. Looking at Hofstede's (1994) formulas (Table 10), question 7 and question 10 were not related to any dimension, question 13 affected Uncertainty Avoidance, and question 14 added to the Power Distance score. If two questions were not related to any dimension and the other two questions each related to only one dimension why were these questions predicting the four dependent variables? To clarify the problem, a factor analysis was conducted on Hofstede's (1994) instrument. The results clearly showed that our dimensions did not match his dimensions.

Table 10. VSM Questions Used to Calculate Individualism, Power Distance, and Uncertainty Avoidance

VSM Question Number	Individualism	Power Distance	Uncertainty Avoidance
1	XXX		
2	XXX		
3		XXX	
4	XXX		
5			
6		XXX	
7			
8	XXX		
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			XXX
14		XXX	
15			
16			XXX
17		XXX	
18			XXX
19			XXX
20			

Specifically, the dimensionality of 20 questions from Hofstede’s (1994) Value Survey Module was analyzed using maximum likelihood factor analysis (See Table 11). Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: the a priori hypothesis that the measure contained 5 dimensions. The scree plot indicated that the initial hypothesis of 5 dimensions was correct. Two factors were rotated using Varimax rotation procedure. The rotated solution, as shown in Table 9, indicated 5 interpretable factors. These factors include the following interpretable factors: ideal work environment, personal determination, traditionalism, current work environment, and locus of control. The ideal work environment factor accounted for 27.37% of the total variance. The personal determination factor accounted for 9.24% of the total

variance. The traditionalism factor accounted for 8.87% of the total variance. The current work environment factor accounted for 7.74% of the total variance. The locus of control variable accounted for 6.73% of the total variance. No item loaded on more than one factor.

Table 11. Loadings on New Factors Using Hofstede's (1994) VSM Questions

Questions	New Factors				
	Ideal Work Environment	Personal Determination	Traditionalism	Current Work Environment	Locus of Control
1					
2	.772				
3	.694				
4					
5					
6	.738				
7	.841				
8	.663				
9		.580			
10		.620			
11		.681			
12					
13			.516		
14				.648	
15				.552	
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					.554

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1

The hypothesis that respondents from the United States would score significantly higher on goal commitment, goal acceptance, job satisfaction, and performance than respondents from Macedonia was supported. This supports Welsh, Luthans, and Sommer's (1993) premise that "What is true for American workers in the U.S. is not always true for workers from other countries" (p. 59). Lower levels of goal commitment, goal acceptance, job satisfaction, and performance in the in Macedonia may be due to several factors including the overall economic state of the country as well as the work atmosphere as Macedonia transitions from socialism to capitalism. While Macedonia has many labor laws, these labor laws are reportedly not enforced and many workers feel an enormous pressure to meet unrealistic performance goals while not being compensated for their efforts. Many workers are trapped in a situation where they can either be pressured to meet unrealistic work goals while being paid a small amount or become unemployed (B. Lazarov, personal communication, September 15, 2001).

Workers from the United States, however, do not experience such inequitable work and compensation plans. Because of enforced labor laws, employees are less frequently exploited as they are generally more fairly compensated for their work. It could, therefore, be assumed that in general, American workers feel more committed to their work goals, more accepting of their work goals, more satisfied with their jobs, and more likely to perform at higher levels than employees from Macedonia who are subjected to a less favorable work environment. These results support Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation which would suggest that when

basic “hygiene” factors, such as pay, working conditions, and pension plans, are not fulfilled to the expectations of the workers, they will be dissatisfied.

Hypothesis 2

The hypothesis that respondents who hypothetically participate in goal setting will score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents who hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting was not supported. While researchers such as Locke suggest that there is little difference between performance when goals are assigned and performance when goals are set with worker participation, many researchers have suggested that such a difference does exist (Erez & Arad, 1986; Latham & Yukl 1975; Levine, 1990). This study supports Locke’s premise that there is no difference between participation and assigned goal setting. In addition, these results do not support previous research that indicated that when workers are given the opportunity to participate in goal setting, goal commitment often occurs (Ambrose et al. 1999; Hinz, Kalnbach, Lorentz, 1997; Locke, 1996). To help explain this result, participants may have responded to the scenarios with their focus’ being on the type of work being done as opposed to the level of goal setting. This may have led to no significant difference between participative and assigned goals setting because that may not have been the participants’ focus.

Hypothesis 3

The hypothesis that respondents who are instructed to imagine they are working in a small company will score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents who are instructed to imagine they are working in a large company was not supported. As noted in the introduction, Hofstede (1980) suggested that in smaller companies lower levels of power distance will exist, and that in larger companies higher levels of power distance will exist. This is

because with fewer employees, small company' employees often have more responsibility and their jobs are enlarged relative to their counterparts in large companies. This results in a flatter organizational structure, which was suggested by Hofstede to generally lead to lower levels of power distance. Because low levels of power distance tend to result in a worker's preference for a more consultative manager, it was, therefore, hypothesized that those individuals who work in small companies will prefer participation in goal setting more than those individuals who work in large companies.

Non-significant results in this study may be due to the nature of the scenarios, as they may not have created a clear enough image in the mind of the reader regarding company size. The number of employees represented in the large and small companies may not have been dramatic enough in the mind of the reader to create a perception about the hypothetical work situation. In addition, company size may have had a greater impact on the four dependent variables if the participant's actual company size were taken into consideration as opposed to the presentation of company size in the scenario. It may have been difficult for participants to imagine working in a company that employs a different number of employees than the company that they actually work in.

Hypothesis 4

The hypothesis that respondents from the United States who hypothetically participate in goal setting will score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents from Macedonia who hypothetically participates in goal setting was not supported. No difference in the effect of participative goal setting vs. assigned goal setting on the four dependent variables was evident. These results in conjunction with the significant results that workers from the United States will overall score significantly higher in the four dependent variables suggest that

participative goal setting is no more effective at increasing dependent variable scores than assigned goal setting. Furthermore, other work environment variables may have a greater impact on the four dependent variables than the level of employee participation in goal setting. Such work variables include “motivators” suggested by Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory of Motivation and may include work ethic, sense of accomplishment, the amount of feedback, competition, and job complexity (Herzberg et al., 1959). Participation in goal setting may be more effective at enhancing the four dependent variables when combined with other managerial strategies that facilitate the workers’ ability to self-actualize. Additionally, it is also possible that gender may influence the effect of participation in goal setting on the four dependent variables. While 64% of the participants from the United States were males, 90% of the participants from Macedonia were females. Different results may have occurred if the distribution of gender was more even across the two countries.

Hypothesis 5

The hypothesis that respondents from Macedonia who hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting will score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents from the United States who hypothetically participated in assigned goal setting was not supported. These results in conjunction with the results indicating that employees who hypothetically participated in goal setting do not score significantly higher on the four dependent variables than respondents who hypothetically participate in assigned goal setting lead to two conclusions: 1) Macedonia and the United States may not be as culturally different as believed. The power distance scores of the United States (6.05 out of a scale of approximately 100) and Macedonia (.3 out of a scale of approximately 100) revealed that little difference exists in their scores and that both participants from the United States and Macedonia are low in power

distance; and 2) Low levels of power distance may not directly influence an employees' preference in participative versus assigned goal setting. Because low power distance is associated with an employee preference for a more consultative type of manager (Hofstede, 1980), it was believed that individuals from countries that are low in power distance would score higher on the four dependent variables when given the opportunity to participate in goal setting than those who are given assigned goals. However, while Macedonia and the United States are both low in power distance, there is no difference in performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction when participating in goal setting versus being given assigned goals. As previously mentioned, it is also possible that gender may influence the effect of participation in goal setting versus assigned goal setting on the four dependent variables. Different results may have occurred if the distribution of gender was more even across the two countries.

Hypothesis 6

The hypothesis that through the use of multiple regression techniques power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, age, education, and gender will predict outcomes on performance, goal acceptance, job satisfaction, and goal commitment was partially supported. Question 7, "In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be for you to have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs" significantly predicted performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction. It is interesting that the opportunity for advancement to higher-level jobs significantly predicts performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction. These results support Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation, which suggests that employees are most satisfied when they are able to reach their fullest potential (Herzberg et al., 1959). It could further be suggested that when employees are given the opportunity for

advancement they are not only working towards organizational goals, they are also working towards their personal goal of reaching their fullest potential. The multiple regression results expand on Herzberg's (1959) Two Factor Theory of Motivation and suggest that when employees are given the opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs, not only will satisfaction increase, but so will performance, goal acceptance, and goal commitment.

Question 13, "How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?", significantly predicts scores on performance, goal commitment, and job satisfaction. This question does not significantly predict goal acceptance. Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation suggests that "hygiene factors" are related to extrinsic variables. In other words, Herzberg suggests that variables outside of ourselves will influence our level of dissatisfaction with work. One may equate nervousness at work with hygiene factors. These hygiene factors include extrinsic variables that can dictate our security such as pay, health insurance, working conditions, and pension plans. Herzberg suggests that while these extrinsic variables may not lead to job satisfaction, they can lead to the lack of dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). Based on the results from the regression analysis, it could possibly be suggested that when workers do not feel nervous or tense at work, they will be more likely to be satisfied. This does not necessarily contradict Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation because participants were not asked how likely they would be dissatisfied or not dissatisfied. These results can be related to the discrepancy in performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction between the United States and Macedonia. While participants from the United States enjoy enforced labor laws and relatively fair pay, participants from Macedonia do not.

Question 14, "How frequently, in your experience, are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors", significantly predicted performance, goal commitment, goal

acceptance, and job satisfaction. It is interesting that this question significantly predicts those dependent variables. One could assume that participant responses to this question not only reflect their observed experience of others with their superiors, but also their personal experience with their own superior. This is because their superior is most likely the superior of those around them. Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation suggests that "motivators" include such intrinsic variables as the opportunity for achievement, responsibility, and recognition (Herzberg et al., 1959). It could be suggested that when employees are afraid to express disagreement with their superiors, they may feel anxious or nervous and not seek additional responsibility. This may possibly lead to a lack of recognition and ultimately affect their performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction.

The Factor Analysis indicated a discrepancy between the dimensions revealed in this study and the dimensions postulated by Hofstede (1980). Hofstede suggested that Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Power Distance were 3 separate and unique theoretical constructs. However, this study would suggest that Hofstede's questions do not form four unique dimensions, but instead 5 factors. Questions 7, 10, 13, and 14 are effective at predicting responses to performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction. Each of these questions appears to fall within a unique factor (See Table 12). Each new factor was reviewed and given a name that seemed to relate to the questions that fell under it. Question 7 fell within a new dimension called "Ideal Work Environment"; question 10 fell within a new dimension called "Personal Determination"; question 13 fell within a new dimension called "Traditionalism"; and question 14 fell within a new dimension called "Current Work Environment".

Table 12. Relationship Between VSM Questions and New Factors

Questions	Factors				
	Ideal Work Environment	Personal Determination	Traditionalism	Current Work Environment	Locus of Control
1	XXX				
2	XXX				
3	XXX				
4					
5					
6	XXX				
7	XXX				
8	XXX				
9		XXX			
10		XXX			
11		XXX			
12					
13			XXX		
14				XXX	
15				XXX	
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					XXX

Limitations and Criticisms

In summary, limitations and criticisms of this study include the following:

- 1) Participants may have responded to the scenarios with their focus being on the type of work being done as opposed to the type of goal setting.
- 2) The company size stated in the scenario may not have been small enough and large may not have been large enough. If such a perceptual difference exists, this may explain the lack of significance when company size is taken into consideration.

- 3) The failure to assess employees' current job level within the company may have affected the results. It is assumed that team leaders were among the participants. They may have responded more positively to participative goal setting than shift workers who may have feared it and been more likely to prefer assigned goal setting. In the future, team leaders should be surveyed separately from the other workers.
- 4) Locke (1996) suggested that in order for goal setting to lead to the achievement of goals, goals need to be both specific and difficult. Research participants may not have found the goals presented in the scenario to fulfill this criterion. In the future, a pilot study on various tasks should be done to find a task that is both specific and difficult.
- 5) Because American research participants lived in the Southeast, their responses do not necessarily represent the entire U.S. population. It has been suggested that individuals from the Southeast tend to be more collectivistic than individuals from the Midwest (Latham & Locke, 1975). Because collectivism is associated with higher levels of power distance, and Macedonia is less individualistic and somewhat higher in power distance than the United States, cultural differences between Macedonia and the United States may not have been as evident. Perhaps if American participants were from the Midwest, more significant cultural differences between the United States and Macedonia may have been evident.
- 6) Because the Macedonian participants were textile factory workers, they may have been more familiar with the task because the task involved stuffing shirts into a box. Because of this, they may have reacted differently to the scenarios. The

Macedonians did not have to hypothetically imagine the scenario because they may have actually experienced it.

- 7) Gender may have influenced the results. More than 90% of the Macedonian participants were females, while 64% of the participants from the United States were male. This may have influenced the discrepancy between the factor analysis results in this study and the dimensions postulated by Hofstede (1994).
- 8) Finally, time may have also been a limiting factor. Participants may have felt rushed to complete the survey and return to their break or to their job.

Future Directions

The nature of the results suggests the need for further study in the area of culture and its effect on such important workplace concepts as performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction. Because Locke (1996) suggests that goals need to be specific and difficult if achievement is to occur, it would be interesting to study goals that are specific and difficult verses those that are vague and easy. It would also be interesting to expand this study to workers in other countries. In addition, the results from this study indicate the need to study additional factors that influence performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction. For example, it would be interesting to study the effect of workplace cooperation, the opportunity for advancement, tension in the workplace, incentives, pay equity, and the ability to disagree with superiors and its impact on those variables. It would also be interesting to further study Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation and the effect of "motivators" on performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance, and job satisfaction when "hygiene factors" are present or the absence thereof (Herzberg et al., 1959). Additionally, it would be interesting to further study the role of age and gender and its influence on performance, goal commitment, goal acceptance,

and job satisfaction. Finally, additional research needs to be done on Hofstede's (1994) instrument and his proposed cultural dimensions.

REFERENCES

- Ambrose M. L., & Kulik, C.T. (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990's. *Journal of Management*, 25, 231-300.
- Arikawa, H., & Templer, D. (1998). Comparison of Japanese and American college students on collectivism and social context of decision-making. *Psychological Reports*, 83, 577-578.
- Barrick, M.R., Mount, M. K., & Strauss, J. P. (1993). Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test of the mediating effects of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 715-722.
- Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (1994). Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25, 233-257.
- Earley, C. & Kanfer, R. (1985). The influence in component participation in role models on goal satisfaction and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36, 378-414.
- Earley, P.C. & Stubblebine, P. (1989). Intercultural Assessment of Performance Feedback. *Group and Organization Studies*, 14, 161-181.
- Elenkov, D. S. (1997). Differences and similarities in managerial values between U.S. and Russian managers: an empirical study. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 27, 25-107.
- Erez, M., & Arad, R. (1986). Participative goal-setting: Social, motivational, and cognitive factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 591-598.
- Erez, M., & Earley, C. P. (1987). Comparative analysis of goal-setting strategies across culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 658-665.

- Erez, M., Earley, P.C., & Hulin, C.L. (1985). The impact of participation on acceptance and performance: a two step model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 50-66.
- Geletkancycz, M. A. 1997. the salience of 'culture's consequences': The effects of cultural values on top executive commitment to the status quo. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, 615-634.
- Globokar, T. (1996). Intercultural management in Eastern Europe: an empirical study of a French-Slovenian plant. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 26, 47-60.
- Haire, M., Ghiselli, E. E., & Porter, L. W. (1966). *Managerial Thinking: An International Study*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Herzberg, F, Mausner B.,& Snyderman. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- Hinsz, V. B., Kalnbach, L. R., & Lorentz, N. R. (1997). Using judgmental anchors to establish challenging self-set goals without jeopardizing commitment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 71, 287-308.
- Hofstede, G. (1994). Value Survey Module [Survey Instrument]. Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Jurkiewicz, C. (2000). Generation X and the Public Employee. *Public Personnel*, 29, 55-75.
- Korman, A. (1977). *Organizational behavior*. Edgewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Latham, G. & Locke, E. (1984). *Goal Setting: A Motivational Technique that Works*. Edgewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Latham, G. P., & Steele, T. P. (1983). The motivational effects of participation verses goal setting on performance. *Accademy of Management Journal*, 26, 406-417.
- Latham, G.P., & Yukl, G.A. (1975). Assigned versus participative goal setting with educated and uneducated woods workers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 299-302.
- Levine, D. (1990). Participation, productivity, and the firms environment. *California Management Review*, 32, 86-101.
- Locke, E. A., (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*,5, 117-124.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*,3, 157-189.
- Luthans, F., Stajkovic, A., Luthans, B. C., & Luthans, K. W. (1998). Applying behavioral management in Eastern Europe. *European Management Journal*, 16, 466-475.
- Miskel, C., and Keller, L. (1973). The educational work components study: An adapted set of measures for work motivation. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 42, 45-50.
- Nasierowski, W., & Mikula, B. (1998). Culture dimensions of polish managers: Hofstede's indices. *Organizational Studies*, 19, 495-510.
- Parnell, B., & Bell, E. (1994). The propensity for participative decision making scale: A measure of managerial propensity for participative decision making. *Administration and Society*, 25, 518-531.
- Pearson, C.A.L. (1987). Participative goal setting as a strategy for improving performance and job satisfaction: A longitudinal evaluation with railway track maintenance gangs. *Human Relations*, 40, 473-489.
- Robbins, S. P. (1997). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, and applications*.

Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Robert, C., Probst, T. M., Martocchio, J. J., Drasgow, F., & Lawler, J.J. (2000). Empowerment and continuous improvement in the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India: predicting fit on the basis of the dimensions of power distance and individualism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 643-658.
- Shermerhorn, J. R., & Bond, M. H. (1997). Cross-cultural leadership dynamics in collectivism and high power distance settings. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 18*, 187-194.
- State Statistical Office. (2002). http://www.stat.gov.mk/english/index_eng.htm
- Todeva, E. (1999). Models for comparative analysis of culture: The case of Poland. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 10*, 606-607.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, & Darius K.S. (1998). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 275-290.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. 1999. Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77* 279-292.
- Welsh, D.H., Luthans, F., & Sommer, S.M. (1993), Managing Russian factory workers: The impact of U.S.-based behavioral and participative techniques. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 58-80.
- Wilk, L, & Redmon, W. (1998). The effects of feedback and goal setting on the productivity and satisfaction of university admissions staff. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 45*, 45-47.
- Winch, G., Millar, C., & Clifton, N. (1997). Culture and organization: the case of transmanche-

link. *British Journal of Management*, 8, 237-250.

Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L., & Premack. (1992). Meta-analysis of the antecedents of personal goal level and the antecedents and consequences of goal commitment. *Journal of Management*, 18, 595-616.

Yearta, K., Maitlis, S., & Briner R. (1995). An exploratory study of goal setting in theory and practice: A motivational technique that works? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 68, 237-253.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Experimental Packets

Instructions

Please read the paragraph on the following page. After reading the paragraph, turn to page 2 and answer the four questions by circling ○ the **number** on the scale that best indicates your response to the question.

For Example:

Indicate below how much you like ice cream.

I do not like ice cream at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I like ice cream a lot
--------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

The Number 5 was circled because the person answering the question likes ice cream but does not like it a lot.

After finishing the questions go and complete the survey on pages 3-8

Company X is located in the United States and is a small company employing 100 people. This company packages and distributes clothing. Imagine you work for this company and the company sets daily goals which means the company decides the minimum number of pieces of clothing a worker must box each day. Workers have no input as to how many pieces of clothing are boxed each day. This company has a history of determining worker goals and deciding what is appropriate worker performance.

Company X is located in the United States and is a large company employing 4000 people. This company packages and distributes clothing. Imagine you work for this company and the company sets daily goals which means the company decides the minimum number of pieces of clothing a worker must box each day. Workers have no input as to how many pieces of clothing are boxed each day. This company has a history of determining worker goals and deciding what is appropriate worker performance.

Company X is located in the United States and is a small company employing 100 people. This company packages and distributes clothing. Imagine you work for this company and the company allows workers to set daily goals which means that the worker decides the minimum number of pieces of clothing that must be boxed each day. Workers have input as to how many pieces of clothing are boxed each day. This company has a history of allowing the workers to set work goals and decide what is appropriate performance.

Company X is located in the United States and is a large company employing 4000 people. This company packages and distributes clothing. Imagine you work for this company and the company allows workers to set daily goals which means that the worker decides the minimum number of pieces of clothing that must be boxed each day. Workers have input as to how many pieces of clothing are boxed each day. This company has a history of allowing the worker to set work goals and decide what is appropriate performance.

Given the previous work situation, answer the following questions.

1. Indicate below the level of performance you would anticipate yourself.

I think this work situation would greatly lower my performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I think this work situation would greatly increase my performance
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

2. Indicate below the level of acceptance you would have for these goals.

I would definitely not accept the goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I would definitely accept the goals
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------------------

3. Indicate below the level of commitment you would have for these goals.

I would definitely not be committed to these goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I would definitely be committed to these goals
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

4. To what extent would you be satisfied in this type of work situation?

I would not be satisfied	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I would be very satisfied
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

Инструкции

Ви се молам проџајте го параграфот на страницава. После цитанје на параграфов, одете на фтората страница И одговорете ги цетирите прасанја со заокрузуванје ○ на бројките на скалата дадена. Заокружете го бројот сто најдобро ве карактеризира.

На пример:

Написете испод колку сакате да јадете сладолед.

Јас не сакам сладолед	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Јас сакам сладолед многу
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------

Бројот 5 бесе заокружен зосто лицноста одговори дека сака сладолед но не многу.

По заврсуванје на прасанјата одете на страниците 3-10.

Голема компанија Ц лоцирана во Македонија која има 2,000 вработени. Оваа компанија пакува И дистрибуира облека. Замисли си дека си вработен во оваа компанија И компанијата им дозволува на вработените да одлучуваат во определувањето на дневните норми сто знаци вработените ја одредуваат минималната норма на парцијна облека сто треба да се пакува секој ден. Оваа компанија има традиција на дозволување на вработените да ги постават нормите за работа И да одлучат сто им одговара.

Мала компанија Ц лоцирана во Македонија која има 50 вработени. Оваа компанија пакува И дистрибуира облека. Замисли си дека си вработен во оваа компанија И компанијата ја определува минималната норма на парцијата сто секој вработен треба да ги спакува дневно. Вработените немаат никакво влијание во одредувањето на нормата. Оваа компанија има традиција во определувањето на нормата на работниците која одговара на вработените.

Голема компанија Ц лоцирана во Македонија која има 2,000 вработени. Оваа компанија пакува И дистрибуира облека. Замисли си дека си вработен во оваа компанија И компанијата ја определува минималната норма на парцијна сто кој вработен треба да ги спакува дневно. Вработените немаат никакво влијание во одредувањето на нормата. Оваа компанија има традиција во определувањето на нормата на работниците која одговара на вработените.

Мала компанија Ц лоцирана во Македонија која има 50 вработени. Оваа компанија пакува И дистрибуира облека. Замисли си дека си вработен во оваа компанија И компанијата им дозволува на вработените да ги одлучуваат во определувањето на дневните норми сто знаци вработените ја одредуваат минималната норма на парцијална облека сто треба да се пакува секој ден. Оваа компанија има традиција на дозволување на вработените да ги постават нормите за работа И да одлучат сто им одговара.

Одговори ги следните прашања на дадената ситуација.

1. На скалата испод одлучи го нивото на твоето мислење.

Јас мислам оваа работна ситуација значително ќе ја намали мојата ефикасност во работата	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Јас мислам оваа работна ситуација значително ќе ја зголеми мојата ефикасност во работата
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

2. На скалата испод одлучи го нивото на прифатанје на овие норми.

Јас дефинитивно не би ги прифатил нормите	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Јас дефинитивно би ги прифатил
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------

3. На скалата испод одлучи го нивото на твојата твојата обврска према овие норми.

Јас дефинитивно не би се обврзал (прифатил) овие норми	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Јас дефинитивно би се обврзал (прифатил) овие норми
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

4. До кој степен би билл задоволен во оваа работна ситуација?

Јас не би бил задоволен	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Јас би бил многу задоволен
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------------

APPENDIX B

Hofstede's Value Survey Module

Please think of an ideal job - disregarding your present job. In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be to you to ... (please circle \bigcirc one answer for each question using the following scale):

- 1 = of utmost importance
- 2 = very important
- 3 = of moderate importance
- 4 = of little importance
- 5 = of very little or no importance

1. have sufficient time for your personal or family life

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

2. have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

3. have a good working relationship with your direct superior

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

4. have security of employment

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

5. work with people who cooperate well with one another

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

6. be consulted by your direct superior in his/her decisions

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

7. have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

8. have an element of variety and adventure in the job

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

In your private life, how important is each of the following to you? (please circle one answer on the scale):

- 1 = of utmost importance**
- 2 = very important**
- 3 = of moderate importance**
- 4 = of little importance**
- 5 = of very little or no importance**

9. Personal steadiness and stability

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

10. Thrift

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

11. Persistence (perseverance)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

12. Respect for tradition

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

13. How often do you fee nervous or tense at work?

1. never
2. seldom
3. sometimes
4. usually
5. always

14. How frequently, in your experience, are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?

1. very seldom
2. seldom
3. sometimes
4. frequently
5. very frequently

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? (please circle ○ one answer on the scale):

- 1 = strongly agree**
2 = agree
3 = undecided
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

15. Most people can be trusted

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

16. One can be a good manager without having precise answers to most questions that subordinates may raise about their work

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

17. An organization structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all cost

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

18. Competition between employees usually does more harm than good

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

19. A company's or organization's rules should not be broken - not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

20. When people have failed in life it is often their own fault

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Hofstede's Value Survey Module in Macedonian

Ви се молам да замислите идеална работа Ѓ не земајќи ја во предвид васата сегасната работа. При одлучувањето на идеална работа, колку значително би било за васЩ(ви се молам да заокружите ○ во дадената скала испод секое прасанје. За секое прасанје заокружете само еден број. Ви се молам користете го следното мероло:

1=од најважно значење

2=многу значајно

3=од средно значење

4=од мало значење

5=од многу мало или не значително значење

1. Да имас доволно време за тебе и твојата фамилија

1	2	3	4	5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

2. Да имас добри физицки услови на работното место (на пример: добра вентилација И светлина, соодветен простор за работа, И т.н.)

1	2	3	4	5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

3. Да имас добри работни односи со твојот претпоставен

1	2	3	4	5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

4. Да имас сигурна работа (да не се пласис дали ќе те отпустат утре или не)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

5. Да работис со луѓе кој добро соработуваат еден со друг

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

6. Претпоставениот или претпоставената да се консултира со тебе пред да донесе одлука

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

7. Да имас санса за унапредуванје на повисока функција во организацијата

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

8. Да имас разновидност во работата т.е. различни варианти на работа наместо монотоност во работна.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Во твојот проватен живот, од колкаво значење е секое од следните празанја? (Ви се молам заокружете на скалата поставена испод секое празанје. За секое празанје заокружете само еден број. Ви се молам користете го следното мероло:

1=од најважно значење

2=многу значајно

3=од средно значење

4=од мало значење

5=од многу мало или не значително значење

9. Лицна рамнотежа и стабилност

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

10. Стеденје

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

11. Упорност (истрајаност)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

12. Поцит према традициите

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

13. Колку често се цуствувае нервозен (раздразлив) или напнат на работа?

1. никога
2. ретко
3. понекогаш
4. вообичаено
5. секогаш

14. Колку често, од твоето искуство, потцинет чиновник се плаши да искиази несогласност со неговиот или нејзиниот претпоставен?

1. многу ретко
2. ретко
3. понекогаш
4. често
5. многу често

До кој степен се согласувае или не се согласувае со секоја од дадените изјави? (Ви се молам заокружете на скалата поставена испод секое прасанје. За секое прасанје заокружете само еден број. Ви се молам користете го следното мероло:

1=силно се согласувам

2=се согласувам

3=не определен

4=не се согласувам

5=силно не се согласувам

15. На повеќето луѓе мозес да им верувае

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**16. Секој може да биде менаџер без да има тоцни одговори за повеќето прасанја
сто потцинетите циновници мозат да го прасат во однос на нивната работа**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**17. Организација каде одредени потцинати циновници имаат двијца
претпоставени треба да се избегне по секоја цена**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

18. Конкуренција меѓу работници обично предизвикува повеќе лосо него добро

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

**19. Правилата на фирмата или организацијата не треба да бидат прекрсени Ѓ
дури иако работниците мислат дека е во интерес на фирмата или
организацијата.**

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

20. Кога луѓето не успеале во нивниот зивот многу цесто е нивна кривица

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

APPENDIX C

Copyright Permission for use of the Value Survey Module

Dear Kristin,

I cannot find the form but I can find the information that you purchased the VSM 1994 with a 50% discount. If I mention in this mail that you have bought the copyright (March 2001) for the use of the VSM for one research project it will be sufficient and you don't need to worry about any problems arriving later.

Best regards,

Rianne Mutsaers
Office Manager IRIC

-----Original Message-----

From: Kristin King [mailto:kking@ab-t.org]

Sent: vrijdag 14 februari 2003 16:35

To: iric@uvt.nl

Subject: VSM

APPENDIX D

Demographic Questions

Some information about yourself (Please Circle one answer):

1. Are you:
 1. male
 2. female

2. How old are you:
 1. Under 20
 2. 20-24
 3. 25-29
 4. 30-34
 5. 35-39
 6. 40-49
 7. 50-59
 8. 60 or over

3. How many years of formal school education (or their equivalent) did you complete (starting with primary school):
 1. 10 years or less
 2. 11 years
 3. 12 years
 4. 13 years
 5. 14 years
 6. 15 years
 7. 16 years
 8. 17 years
 9. 18 years or over

4. What is your nationality? _____

5. What was your nationality at birth? _____

Demographic Questions in Macedonian

Лицна информација за вас (Ви се молам заокружете ○ за секое прашање)

1. Дали си:

1. **маско**
2. **зенско**

2. Колку години имас:

3. **испод 20**
4. **20-24**
5. **25-29**
6. **30-34**
7. **35-39**
8. **40-49**
9. **50-59**
10. **60- и над**

3. Колку години од сколско вообрасование имас (поцнувајќи од прво оделение):

- a. **10 години или помалку**
- б. **11 години**
- ц. **12 години**
- д. **13 години**
- е. **14 години**
- ф. **15 години**
- г. **16 години**
- х. **17 години**
- и. **18 години или повеќе**

4. Која националност си? _____

5. Која националност си по рагање? _____

VITA

Kristin M. King

EDUCATION

M.A., Psychology, East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN, 2003. 3.85/4.0 GPA
Honors: PSI CHI National Honor Society

Certified Grant Writing Specialist, National Grant Writers Association, 2002

B.S., Psychology, East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN, 1999
Honors: PSI CHI National Honor Society

PRESENTATIONS:

“The Grant Seeking Process”
Bristol, TN Chamber of Commerce (2003)

“Cultural Implications on Employee Goal Setting”
National Social Science Convention (2001)

EXPERIENCE

The Alliance for Business and Training, Elizabethton TN 10/01-Present

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SPECIALIST

- Develop methods of measuring US Department of Labor federal grant outcomes
- Evaluate training providers and provide consultation to employers regarding training opportunities
- Assist in the development of collaborated training efforts between employers
- Evaluate training curriculum and suggest methods of improvement
- Actively participate in economic development grant writing.
- Significantly contributed in writing and developing a grant proposals with awards in excess of 3.43 million dollars

East Tennessee State University Upward Bound, Johnson City, TN 09/01-04/02

INSTRUCTOR

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN 08/00-05/01

INSTRUCTOR

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN 08/99-05/00

STATISTICS TUTOR