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This study investigates the malleability of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions for three groups of students. Underlying issues include the convergence, divergence, and crossvergence debates regarding stability of national values. Hofstede’s Value Survey Module (VSM, Hofstede, 1994) was administered to three groups of students: U.S. students, Russian students studying in Russia, and Russian students studying in the United States for a minimum of two years. Scores for the five dimensions are reported by country. Responses indicated that U.S. students scored the highest on Individualism and the lowest on Power Distance and Masculinity. Russian students studying in Russia scored the highest on Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity. Russian students studying in the United States scored the lowest on Uncertainty Avoidance and showed some convergence on dimensions of Individuality, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Power Distance. No differences were found between the three student groups for Long-term Orientation. Support for divergence theory was upheld between the U.S. and Russian groups of students.

KEYWORDS cultural values, Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, U.S./Russian students

INTRODUCTION

This investigation is based on a stream of research that has explored the question of whether national values are stable over time or change as a result...
of exposure to another nation’s values. This study focused on the convergence, divergence, and crossvergence controversies pertaining to the malleability of national values.

Cross-national variations on malleability of values have been investigated using a wide array of instruments (e.g., Chinese Value Survey, Schwartz Value Inventory, Rokeach Value Survey, Hofstede’s Value Survey Module, Inglehart’s World Value Survey) and conceptual bases. Among these, Hofstede’s (1980a) work has been the most widely used (Ardichvili & Kuchinke, 2002; Cheung & Chan, 2010; Elenkov, 1997, 1998; Entrekin & Chung, 2001; Giacobbe-Miller, Miller, Zhang, & Victorov, 1999; Girlando & Anderson, 2001; Girlando, Anderson, & Zerillo, 2004; Heuer, Cummings, & Hutabarat, 1999; Huettinger, 2008; Kim & Kim, 2010; Li, Zinn, Chick, Graefe, & Absher, 2004; Naumov & Puffer, 2000; Nieves, Mujtaba, Pellet, & Cavico, 2006; Prasnikar, Pahor, & Svetlik, 2008; Rarick & Nickerson, 2008; Rhodes & Emery, 2003; Rose, 2008; Soares, Farhangmehr, & Shoham, 2006; Spector et al., 2001; Tang & Koveos, 2008; Twaijri & Al-Muhaiza, 1996; Twati, 2008; Veiga, Yanouzas, & Buchholtz, 1995; Wu, 2006, 2008; Yoon, 2009; Zhang & Ma, 2009 to name a few). His classification system consists of four dimensions, established in his early work: (1) Individualism/Collectivism (IND); (2) Power Distance (PDI); (3) Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI); and (4) Masculinity/Femininity (MAS). A fifth dimension developed by Hofstede and Bond in 1985 titled “Long-term/Short-term Orientation” (LTO) was also included for study in this work. A short description of these five dimensions is included.

Hofstede (1980a, 1991, 2001) and Hofstede & Hofstede (2005) have maintained that values are stable constructs held by different cultures over a long period of time. This is particularly true for the dimensions of Individualism and Power Distance (Hofstede, 1993, 2001; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Other scholars have held differing views of the stability of national values. This dispute has evolved into three theoretical orientations, namely convergence, divergence, and crossvergence.

CONVERGENCE, DIVERGENCE, AND CROSSVERGENCE

Convergence, the earliest school of thought, maintains that under globalization, different cultures worldwide are moving toward a universal set of values (Brouthers & Brouthers, 2001; Fang, 2006; Giacobbe-Miller, Miller, Zhang, & Victorov, 1999; Heuer, Cummings, & Hutabarat, 1999; Nieves, Mujtaba, Pellet, & Cavico, 2006). Proponents of this view have held that non-Western countries are moving relentlessly toward a Western culture and its related value system (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

In contrast, the divergence school of thought maintains that despite globalization, individual cultures tend to remain significantly distinct over

The third and most recent school of thought is termed crossvergence. Proponents hold that as cultures are exposed to each other, new cultural characteristics develop that are distinct from those of the interacting cultures (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Giacobbe-Miller, Miller, Zhang, & Victorov, 1999; Kelley, MacNab, & Worthley, 2006; Khilji, Zeidman, Drory, Tirmizi, & Srinivas, 2010; Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1993; Ralston et al., 2006).

**NATIONAL VALUE DIFFERENCES**

The question of the stability of national values has pragmatic implications. For example, using Hofstede’s work as a basis, it can be speculated that people in low Power Distance countries (such as the United States) have more power, and people in high Power Distance countries (such as Russia) do not. Hofstede & Hofstede (2005) noted that both Power Distance and Individualism affect the type of leadership most likely to be effective in a country. For example, Shane (1995) studied 43 organizations from 68 countries in terms of the management of innovation and found that uncertainty-accepting societies may be more innovative than uncertainty-avoiding societies. Further, Shane (1995) found that both Masculinity and Uncertainty Avoidance affect people’s motivations. While Hofstede’s cultural dimensions have been used extensively, empirical studies have investigated the impact of cultural differences on different aspects of managerial behavior not directly measuring cultural values. Such work has included (the list is illustrative, not exhaustive): perceptions of corporate social responsibility (Kim & Kim, 2010); accounting practices (Finch, 2009); college students (Kobayashi, Kerbo, & Sharp, 2010); public diplomacy (Yun, 2008); brand loyalty (Lam, 2007); joint ventures (Li, Lam, & Qian, 2001); investment opportunities (McCarthy, Puffer, & Naumov, 2000); managing workers (Gordon, 2009; Najera, 2008); leadership styles (Wu, 2008); conflict management styles (Tsai & Chi, 2009); executive appraisal (Entrekin & Chung, 2001); codes of ethics/business ethics (Beekun, Stedham, Yamamura, & Barghouti, 2003; Lu, Rose, & Blodgett, 1999); international alliances (Girlando & Anderson, 2001); Information Systems (Twati, 2008); workgroups and teams (Harrison, McKinnon, Wu, & Chow, 2000); and technical and scientific communication (Anderson, Glassman, & Pinelli, 2000).

The literature to some extent has upheld the stability of Hofstede’s dimensions. Table 1 contains the findings of several studies on the question of the stability of cultural values using various instruments and methodologies and the outcomes are mixed. This may be attributed to differences in instruments and methodologies used, and rigor of research methodology.
The United States and Russia were selected for study for two reasons. First, the two countries presented deep cultural differences (Girlando & Anderson, 2001; Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, & Yu, 2008) while at the same time they have been significantly increasing their trade and investments in the past 10 years.

### U.S./RUSSIA CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

The United States and Russia were selected for study for two reasons. First, the two countries presented deep cultural differences (Girlando & Anderson, 2001; Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, & Yu, 2008) while at the same time they have been significantly increasing their trade and investments in the past 10 years.
The United States is still one of the large investors and major trading partner for Russia (Nestmann, 2009). Russia represents an untapped future market of 150 million potential consumers for the United States (Anders & Usachev, 2003). Second, the United States was selected as the prototype of Western practices whereas Russia, given its history, posed a rich foundation for investigating potential cultural change.

Unfortunately, research concerning U.S./Russian differences has been hampered as data on Russia are sparse (Alexashin & Blenkinsopp, 2005; Anderson, Glassman, & Pinelli, 1997; Beekun, Stedham, Yamamura, & Barghouti, 2003; Elenkov, 1997, 1998; Girlando, 1998; Girlando & Anderson, 2001; Mitry & Bradley, 1999; Naumov & Puffer, 2000). Early studies of national values based on a sample of managers reported major differences between U.S. and Russian managers (Bollinger, 1993; Furnham, 1993; Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, & Yu, 1995; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987; Trompenaars, 1993; Veiga, Yanouzas, & Buchholtz, 1995). However, these reports are less than convincing considering the methodologies and populations examined. Bollinger (1993) for example, using Hofstede’s instrument, surveyed 55 directors and executives in a training program at the Higher Commercial Management School of Moscow. He found Russians to be characterized by high Power Distance, low Individualism, high Uncertainty Avoidance, and low Masculinity.

Later, Veiga, Yanouzas, & Buchholtz (1995) who also measured national values of 170 Russian managers and 149 U.S. managers, confirmed earlier data on differences between Russia and the United States. Veiga, Yanouzas, & Buchholtz (1995) did not use the Hofstede’s instrument but used a scenario instrument that approximated Russian values in terms of Hofstede’s dimensions. Still, their results confirmed Hofstede’s estimates and Bollinger’s empirical results with the exception of the dimension of Masculinity/Femininity, which the researchers did not test. Elenkov (1997) in his empirical study of U.S. and Russian managers found “Americans are more individualistic than Russians. The culture in the United States is also characterized by lower power distance and uncertainty avoidance than the Russian culture.” (p. 102). Bradley (1999) examined cultural dimensions for factory managers and factory workers in Yoshkar-la, Russia (the distribution is one factory manager for every three workers). The results indicated that both factory managers and factory workers had similar scores for Individualism, Power Distance, Uncertainty-Avoidance, and Masculinity. However, there was a difference in scores for Long-term Orientation, with factory workers scoring higher than managers. Bradley indicates that “the higher and thus longer time orientation of the workers establishes the need for persistence, thrift, order, and a sense of shame. This is in contrast to the very low value for the factory manager that orients them to a shorter term value system than the workers.” (Bradley, 1999, p. 58).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study / Culture</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Power distance</th>
<th>Uncertainty avoidance</th>
<th>Masculinity/femininity</th>
<th>Long-term orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Empirical Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede (1980a)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoppe (1990, 1998)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuer, Cummings, &amp; Hutabarat (1999)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not Studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girlando &amp; Anderson (2001)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russia – Empirical Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollinger (1993)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not Studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veiga, Yanouzas, &amp; Buchholtz (1995)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Measured</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naumov &amp; Puffer (2000)</td>
<td>Moderate to Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Fairly High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not Studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girlando &amp; Anderson (2001)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russia—Estimated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede (1993)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not Studied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In later work, using Hofstede’s Value Survey Model (VSM, 1994), Naumov & Puffer (2000) found Russian respondents (managers, professionals, students, faculty, and university administrators) to be moderate in Individualism, Power Distance, and Masculinity, while being fairly high in Uncertainty Avoidance and Paternalism. In contrast, Girlando & Anderson (2001) found Russian students to be low on Individualism and Long-term Orientation and high on Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity.

U.S. national values based on empirical findings (Hofstede, 1993; Heuer, Cummings, & Hutabarat, 1999; Hoppe, 1990, 1998) places them high in Individualism (Elenkov, 1997), and low in Power Distance, low in Uncertainty Avoidance and high in Masculinity. Hofstede (1997) characterizes U.S. culture as high in Individualism and Masculinity, and low in Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Long-term Orientation. Hofstede (1993) hypothesized that Russian managers would be high in Uncertainty-Avoidance and Power Distance, low in Masculinity, and medium-range in Individualism. Alexashin & Blenkinsopp (2005) state that “High power distance is reflected in Russian managers’ difficulties in accepting that they might learn from employees at lower levels of the organization.” (p. 430). Finally, empirical work on Long-term Orientation corroborates Hofstede’s (1993) findings that Russians would demonstrate low levels of Long-term Orientation consistent with U.S. scores. Table 2. summarizes the findings of these studies.

Given the scarcity of empirical research comparing U.S. and Russian cultural differences, it was felt that this study would contribute significantly to an understanding of differences between cultures. Keeping in mind the present context and lack of research on U.S. and Russian cultural differences, the following questions were investigated:

1. Would U.S. students report significantly higher levels of Individualism than both groups of Russian students?
2. Would U.S. students report significantly lower levels of Power Distance than both groups of Russian students?
3. Would U.S. students report significantly lower levels of Uncertainty Avoidance than both groups of Russian students?
4. Would U.S. students report significantly higher levels of Masculinity than both groups of Russian students?
5. Would there be differences in Long-term Orientation between U.S. students and both groups of Russian students?

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The study entailed a comparison of national value orientation for three groups of students: (1) U.S. students, (2) Russian students studying in
Russia, and (3) Russian students studying in the United States for at least two years. There were 246 students from the United States (males = 119, females = 127), 232 Russian students studying in Russia (male = 107, female = 123), and 40 Russian students studying in the United States for at least two years (males = 23, females = 17). Table 3 summarizes demographic information for the three groups of students.

Research Design

The data for this study were collected between 1997 and 2003. The present study sampled U.S. students, Russian students studying in Russia, Russian students studying in the U.S. for at least two years. The rationale for studying these three groups was to ascertain U.S. and Russian value orientations and measure what changes, if any, occur in the value orientation of Russian students exposed to U.S. culture.

The sample of Russians in the United States may be somewhat biased in that it may be inferred that it consists of a group of students who by virtue of their choice to study in the United States probably identify more closely with its value system than does the average Russian student. Yet, rather than

| TABLE 3 | Demographic Variables for U.S. Students (U.S.), Russian Students Studying in Russia (RUS), and Russian Students Studying in the United States for at Least Two Years (RUSSIA/US) |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 119 (48.3%) | 107 (46.1%) | 23 (57.5%) |
| Female | 127 (51.4%) | 123 (53.0%) | 17 (42.5%) |
| Age | | |
| Less than 20 years | 60 (24.4%) | 147 (63.6%) | 1 (2.6%) |
| 20–24 Years | 103 (41.9%) | 59 (25.5%) | 11 (28.2%) |
| 25–29 Years | 38 (15.4%) | 23 (10.0%) | 23 (59.0%) |
| 30–34 Years | 19 (7.7%) | 1 (0.4%) | 4 (10.3%) |
| 35–39 Years | 12 (4.9%) | 1 (0.4%) | – |
| 40–49 Years | 11 (4.5%) | – | – |
| 50–59 Years | 3 (1.2%) | – | – |
| Years of Formal Education | | |
| Less than 10 Years | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (0.9%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| 11 Years | 1 (0.4%) | 48 (20.7%) | 1 (2.5%) |
| 12 Years | 14 (5.7%) | 82 (35.3%) | 1 (2.5%) |
| 13 Years | 38 (15.4%) | 40 (17.2%) | 1 (2.5%) |
| 14 Years | 38 (15.4%) | 18 (7.8%) | 1 (2.5%) |
| 15 Years | 52 (21.2%) | 27 (11.6%) | 7 (17.5%) |
| 16 Years | 36 (14.7%) | 7 (3.0%) | 5 (12.5%) |
| 17 Years | 24 (9.8%) | 4 (1.7%) | 9 (22.5%) |
| 18 Years or over | 40 (16.3%) | 3 (1.3%) | 15 (37.5%) |
| Field of Study | | |
| Business | 123 (50.0%) | 118 (50.9%) | 12 (30.0%) |
| Sciences | 91 (37.0%) | 68 (29.3%) | 19 (47.5%) |
| Arts | 3 (1.2%) | 5 (2.2%) | 2 (5.0%) |
| Other | 29 (11.8%) | 33 (14.2%) | 7 (17.5%) |
hindering the validity of the study, this possible bias may strengthen it. The combination of the possible bias and exposure to U.S. culture would lead one to expect to find similar value orientation between U.S. students and Russian students studying in the United States. However, should it be found that these Russian students are similar to Russian students in Russia; there would be additional evidence for divergence theory (Girlando, 1998).

Instrument: Value Orientation

Due to the lack of valid and reliable Russian instruments for assessing the impact of culture, this study used Value Survey Module (VSM; Hofstede, 1994) which is the most widely used and cited instrument for measuring the impact of culture. “The VSM is a 26-item (20 content questions and 6 demographic questions) questionnaire developed for comparing culturally determined values between people from two or more countries” (VSM Manual, Hostede, 1994, p. 1). The VSM measures five dimensions of national culture: (1) Individualism/Collectivism, (2) Power Distance, (3) Uncertainty Avoidance, (4) Masculinity/Femininity, and (5) Long-term Orientation. All items are answered using a 5-point scale. For the first 12 items, subjects are asked to rate the items, where 1 = of utmost importance to 5 = of very little or no importance. For the next two items, subjects are asked to respond on a scale (where 1 = never to 5 = always). The last six items ask subjects to respond on the scale where 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Examples of the items on the different dimensions include:

- **Individualism/Collectivism**, 4 items (In your ideal job, how important would it be for you to: (a) “Have sufficient time for your personal or family life?” or (b) “Have security of employment?”
- **Power Distance**, 4 items (In your ideal job, how important would it be for you to: (a) “Have a good working relationship with your direct superior?” or (b) “Be consulted by your direct superiors in his or her decisions?”
- **Uncertainty Avoidance**, 4 items (“How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?” or “One can be a good manager without having precise answers that subordinates may raise about their work”)
- **Masculinity/Femininity**, 4 items (To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: (a) “Most people can be trusted,” or (b) “When people have failed in life, it is often their own fault.”)
- **Long-term Orientation**, 4 items (In your private life, how important is (a) “thrift” or (b) “personal steadiness and stability?”).

The content questions are scored on a 5-point scale and “index scores are derived from the mean scores on questions for the national or regional samples of respondents” (VSM Manual, Hofstede, 1994; p. 3). Using Hofstede’s formulas, the 20 items from Hofstede’s VSM 94 allow the scores to be calculated on each of the five dimensions. Scores on all five dimensions
range from a 0 to 100, although Hofstede (1994) indicates that scores below 0 and higher than 100 are possible. With the Power Distance Index, a 0 indicates small power distance, whereas a 100 indicates a large Power Distance. With the Masculinity Index, a score of 0 is strongly feminine, whereas a 100 is strongly masculine. With the Individualism Index, a 0 indicates strong Collectivism, whereas a 100 indicates strong Individualism. With the Uncertainty Avoidance Index, a 0 indicates weak Uncertainty Avoidance, whereas a 100 indicates strong Uncertainty Avoidance. With the Long-term Orientation Index, a 0 indicates a very Short-term Orientation, whereas a 100 indicates a very Long-term Orientation.

The VSM 94 was obtained from the Institute for Research and Intercultural Cooperation (IRIC), which provided Russian and English versions of the questionnaire and instructions for its administration. Back translation to ensure equivalence was accomplished using three sources. First, a native Russian who had been a professor of sociology at the University of Moscow and who had lived in the United States and was fluent in English, reviewed the instrument and made minor changes in the Russian version. To ensure further equivalence, her work was reviewed and approved by a U.S. professor of Russian language and a Russian student of journalism who were English fluent and had lived in the United States for two years. All reviewers made only minor changes to the instrument.

Obtaining a sample of Russian students who had lived and studied in the United States (RUSSIA/U.S.) for at least two years was done through two sources. The first source was Russian students attending the meeting of the Association of International Educators Conference. A second was drawn from a Russian student discussion group on the Internet. Each participant was contacted using e-mail that explained the nature and purpose of the questionnaire and advised that responses were anonymous and would only be presented only in aggregate form.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA**

The data was analyzed and index scores were calculated on the five dimensions using Hofstede's formulas, which are based on the mean scores of responses multiplied by constant numbers as indicated by Hofstede in the VSM 94 (Hofstede, 1994). Using Hofstede's (VSM 94) instrument, scores were derived for each of the three groups. The aggregate results of the five cultural dimensions by country are presented in Table 4.

**Individualism**

The U.S. students have a strongly individualistic value. Russian students who had been studying in the United States tended to be more individualistic than
their Russian counterparts. As predicted, both groups of Russian students scored lower on Individualism than U.S. students.

Group scores for the dimension of Individualism indicated that U.S. students scored higher in Individualism (score = 90) than the other two groups (Russian students = 58, Russia/U.S. students = 78). Significant differences were found between U.S. students and Russian students (p = .000). However, differences in Individualism between Russian and Russian students who had been exposed to Western values for two years or more just missed being significant (p = .053). Similar findings have been obtained by Girlando & Anderson (2001) when examining cultural differences between Russian and U.S. students. Along similar lines, Ardichvili & Kuchinke (2002) found that U.S. employees exhibited the highest level of Individualism among the six countries studied (Russia, Germany, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Georgia).

An analysis of variance on individual scores for Individualism shows that of the six significant pairs, three indicated significant differences between the United States and Russia (items 1, 4, and 8), whereas three indicated significant differences between the United States and Russia/U.S. (items 1, 4, and 8). For two of the items (items 1 and 4), average scores obtained from the two Russian groups resembled each other while they differed from the scores obtained by U.S. students. (See Table 5.)

### Power Distance

The U.S. students scored significantly lower on Power Distance than Russian students or Russian students in the United States for at least two years. Group scores for the dimension of Power Distance indicated that both groups of Russian students scored higher levels of Power Distance than U.S. students. Statistically significant differences were found in Power Distance scores of the U.S. (score = 24) compared to the Russian group (score = 52) (p = .000), and between U.S. students (Score = 24) and Russia/U.S. students (score = 43) (p < .05).

An analysis of variance of individual scores for Power Distance shows that of the five significant pairs, three indicated significant differences between the United States and Russia (items 6, 14, and 17) and two indicated
### TABLE 5  Analysis of Variance for Scores on Individualism for the Three Groups of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>U.S. ($n = 246$)</th>
<th>Russia ($n = 232$)</th>
<th>Russia/US ($n = 40$)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significantly different pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have sufficient time for your personal or family life.</td>
<td>1.66 (.78)</td>
<td>2.12 (.85)</td>
<td>2.13 (.75)</td>
<td>16.63**</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia/U.S.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have good physical working conditions.</td>
<td>1.89 (.79)</td>
<td>1.98 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.20 (.75)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have security of employment.</td>
<td>1.84 (.86)</td>
<td>2.34 (1.07)</td>
<td>2.38 (.89)</td>
<td>13.70**</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia/U.S.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have an element of variety and adventure in the job.</td>
<td>2.01 (.85)</td>
<td>2.87 (1.08)</td>
<td>2.35 (1.18)</td>
<td>35.73**</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia &amp; Russia/U.S.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers refer to the items in the VSM 94.

*p < .05, **p < .01.
significant differences between the United States and Russia/U.S. (items 6 and 14). (See Table 6.)

**Uncertainty Avoidance**

Russian students studying in Russia reported higher levels (but not significantly different) of Uncertainty Avoidance than U.S. students or Russian/U.S. students. Group scores for Uncertainty Avoidance indicated that the Russian students (score = 67) scored higher than U.S. students (score = 58). However, no statistically significant differences were obtained between the three groups.

An analysis of variance of individual scores for Uncertainty Avoidance shows two significant pairs: United States and Russia (item 13) and United States and Russia/U.S. (item 18). For three of the items (items 16, 18, and 19), average scores obtained from the U.S. students and Russian students resembled each other. (See Table 7.)

**Masculinity/Femininity**

Both groups of Russian students exhibited the highest level of Masculinity, while the U.S. students exhibited the lowest levels of masculinity. These results are contradictory to prior work by Hofstede (1993) and Hoppe (1998) who categorized the United States as a high Masculine society and Hofstede (2001) and Bollinger (1993) who characterized Russian society as a low Masculine society.

Group scores for Masculinity indicated that while both groups of Russian students (Russia score = 78, Russia/U.S. score = 74) scored higher than U.S. students (score = 39), no statistically significant differences were obtained between the three groups. Similar results were obtained by Ardichvili & Kuchinke (2002) found Russian respondents to be higher (mean score = 101.30) on Masculinity versus U.S. respondents (mean score = 12.80).

An analysis of variance of individual scores for Masculinity/Femininity shows that of the four significant pairs, three indicated significant differences between the United States and Russia (items 7, 15, and 20), whereas one indicated significant differences between the United States and Russia/U.S. (item 15). For two of the items (items 5 and 20), average scores obtained from the two Russian groups resembled each other while they differed from the scores obtained by U.S. students. (See Table 8.)

**Long-Term Orientation**

There were no significant differences in index scores for Long-term orientation between the three groups. These findings corroborate Hofstede’s (1993) speculation that Russia is similar to the United States in being characterized as a short-term-oriented society. Similar results were obtained by Hofstede and Bond’s (1988) study of U.S. respondents and Hofstede’s prediction (2001)
### TABLE 6  Analysis of Variance for Scores on Power Distance for the Three Groups of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>U.S. (n = 246)</th>
<th>Russia (n = 232)</th>
<th>Russia/U.S. (n = 40)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significantly different pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Have a good working relationship with your direct superior.</td>
<td>1.90 .79</td>
<td>2.15 .89</td>
<td>1.98 .69</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Be consulted by your direct superior in his/her decisions.</td>
<td>2.44 .85</td>
<td>2.80 1.02</td>
<td>2.93 1.02</td>
<td>8.19*</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How frequently in your experience are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?</td>
<td>3.33 .93</td>
<td>3.76 .93</td>
<td>3.30 1.22</td>
<td>10.96**</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia/U.S.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. An organizational structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all costs.</td>
<td>2.76 1.06</td>
<td>2.20 1.12</td>
<td>2.60 1.22</td>
<td>12.71**</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers refer to the items in the VSM 94.

*p < .05, **p < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>U.S. (n = 246)</th>
<th>Russia (n = 232)</th>
<th>Russia/U.S. (n = 40)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significantly different pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. One can have a good manager without having precise answers to questions that subordinates may raise about their work.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Competition between employees usually does more harm than good.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers refer to the items in the VSM 94.

*p < .05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Work with people who cooperate well with one another.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>6.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Most people can be trusted.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>32.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. When people have failed in life it is often their own fault.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>7.50**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers refer to the items of the VSM 94.

p < .05, **p < .01.

TABLE 8 Analysis of Variance for Scores on Masculinity/Femininity for the Three Groups of Students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>U.S. (n = 246)</th>
<th>Russia (n = 232)</th>
<th>Russia/U.S. (n = 40)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significantly different pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Personal steadiness and stability.</td>
<td>1.78 .76</td>
<td>1.99 .91</td>
<td>2.20 .88</td>
<td>6.30**</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia/U.S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Thrift.</td>
<td>2.57 .80</td>
<td>2.74 .93</td>
<td>3.00 .88</td>
<td>4.99*</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia/U.S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Persistence (perseverance).</td>
<td>2.06 .76</td>
<td>2.16 .88</td>
<td>2.45 .84</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia/U.S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Respect for tradition.</td>
<td>2.65 .96</td>
<td>2.98 1.07</td>
<td>3.25 1.10</td>
<td>9.65**</td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. &amp; Russia/U.S.**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers refer to the items of the VSM 94.

*p < .05, **p < .01.
for Russia that held that both groups would demonstrate low Long-term Orientation. However, the results contradict those obtained by Ardichvili and Kuckinke (2002) who found that of the six countries studied, Russian employees scored highest on Long-term Orientation (mean score = 83.55), whereas U.S. employees scored the lowest (mean score = 43.70).

An analysis of individual items measuring Long-term Orientation indicated that Russia/U.S. students scored the highest of all three groups. An analysis of variance of individual scores shows that of the six significant pairs, two indicated significant differences between the U.S. and Russia (items 9 and 12), whereas four indicated significant differences between the U.S. and Russia/U.S. (items 9, 10, 11, and 12). For item 11, average scores obtained from the U.S. and Russian group resembled each other whereas they differed from the scores obtained by the Russian/U.S. students. (See Table 9.)

DISCUSSION

The findings in this exploratory empirical study are mixed. U.S. national value orientation showed minor variation from earlier work (Hofstede, 1980a; Hoppe, 1990; Heuer, Cummings, & Hutabarat, 1999) with the exception of the shift in the dimension of Masculinity. Previous work by Girlando & Anderson (2001) has indicated similar findings with the dimension of Masculinity.

With the Russia/U.S. student group, there were differences in cultural values from previously established studies (Bollinger, 1993; Veiga, Yanouzas, & Buchholtz, 1995). Responses from these students reported scores that suggest several shifts in values. Results from the VSM 94, showed some convergence on the dimensions of Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance and Power Distance scores. These students also reported an increase in the dimension of Masculinity.

Similar national value stability was found among Russian students in Russia who showed the same trend adhering to previously reported Russian work values for Individualism, Power Distance, and Uncertainty Avoidance. Bollinger (1993) found a downward shift on the dimension of masculinity, whereas research by Girlando & Anderson (2001) also found an upward shift on Masculinity for Russian students. The results of the current study on Masculinity corroborate findings obtained by Girlando & Anderson (2001).

The shifts in Masculinity among both Russian and U.S. students suggest a malleability of this dimension. It may be speculated that the dimension is a function of the times. Massive social changes in the U.S. society may possibly have created new value systems that encompass the convergence of male and female views. On the other hand, Russia’s encounters with the free-market and competitive capitalism may have resulted in a preference for the “Masculine” partiality for assertive behaviors such as dominance, freedom
on the job, advancement, and earnings rather than the “Feminine” partiality toward “nurturing” factors such as interpersonal relationships, relationships with co-workers, and social aspects of the job. This, however, is conjecture but these shifts warrant further research to determine whether the changes are attributable to age factors or stable societal trends.

In the case of Russian students who had not had been exposed to a free market economy, the scores obtained from this study compared favorably to Hofstede’s (2001) projections and empirical work on all but one dimension (Masculinity) that moved from a hypothesized low to a high score.

These findings of this study uphold both convergence and divergence theories of culture. No evidence was found of crossvergence, which was not surprising as there was no prolonged exposure to an alternative culture. Yet, despite the very limited experience of those Russia/U.S. students who had been exposed to a free market economy for least two years, it can be seen that their scores diverged to a more Western view.

Future Research

This exploratory inquiry gives rise to a number of issues for further research. The findings of this empirical study indicate the need to address the question of whether change in values will take place, the rate and circumstances under which cultural values change, the stability of the measures of national values, and impact of national values on managerial and work behavior. As more and more international students study in the U.S., a new stream of research is needed to explore value changes and the stability of such values after the subjects return to their home country. Thus, longitudinal research is needed to track any shifts.

Finally, future research should consider examining issues such as:

(a) Do the shifts in national values pose only a transitory phenomenon?
(b) Are these changes stable as a function of a combination of chronological age and a short exposure to Western values or will the absence of drastic system-wide changes in Russia reinforce traditional work values?

Caution should be used in interpreting the results of the study and the recommendation is that the study be conducted with a representative sample of Russian students. However, the study provides valuable information about cultural values and the malleability of these values.
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**APPENDIX: DIMENSIONS OF CULTURAL VALUES**

INDIVIDUALISM: “The opposite of collectivism; together, they form one of the dimensions of national cultures. Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family only.” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 401).
COLLECTIVISM: “The opposite of Individualism; together, they form one of the dimensions of national cultures. Collectivism stands for a society in which people from birth onward are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty.” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 399).

MASCULINITY: “The opposite of femininity; together, they form one of the dimensions of national cultures. Masculinity stands for a society in which emotional gender roles are clearly distinct; men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success; women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 402).

FEMININITY: “The opposite of masculinity; together, they form one of the dimensions of national cultures. Femininity stands for a society in which emotional gender roles overlap: both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 401).

POWER DISTANCE: “The extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally. One of the dimensions of national cultures (from small to large).” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 402).

UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE: “The extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations. One of the dimensions of national cultures (from weak to strong).” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 403).

LONG-TERM ORIENTATION: “The opposite of short-term orientation; together, they form a dimension of national cultures originally labeled Confucian work dynamism. Long-term orientation stands for the fostering of virtues oriented toward future rewards, in particular perseverance and thrift.” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 401).

SHORT-TERM ORIENTATION: “The opposite of long-term orientation; together, they form a dimension of national cultures. Short-term orientation stands for fostering of virtues related to the past and present—in particular, respect for tradition, preservation of “face,” and fulfilling social obligations.” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p. 403).