



CATOLICA
LISBON
BUSINESS & ECONOMICS



FGV

EBAPE

The relationship between cultural dimensions and goal orientation

Madalena Nogueira

Dissertation written under the supervision of Ishani Aggarwal

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements for the MSc in Management with specialization in Strategy and Entrepreneurship, at the Universidade Católica Portuguesa and for the MSc Program in Management, at the Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública, Fundação Getulio Vargas, 28.05.2018.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is the conclusion of a ride where I crossed paths with a lot of people who helped me make it possible in a constructive and motivating way. They have also contributed to building up the person I am today.

I begin by acknowledging my thesis advisor Dr.^a Ishani Aggarwal from Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas at Fundação Getúlio Vargas (FGV-EBAPE) for her availability and guidance during the development of the thesis. Dr.^a Ishani's cooperation and knowledge about the thesis topic was crucial to defining a subject that I really wanted to work on, as well as, to found the best way to approach it. A deeply acknowledgment to Gabriela Cuconato for her precious help with this thesis, as well as, her unconditional availability for me.

I also want to thank my friends for all their support over the past eleven months and for never letting me feel alone when so far from home. In this matter, a special thank you to Leonor Brito and Carolina Fortunato. To all my friends that I met in Brazil, thank you for this amazing year and for being my second family. A special acknowledgment to Maria João Santos for never let me demoralize and for all the motivation and support she gave to me during this important period of my life.

Finally, I want to thank my parents and my sister Margarida for supporting all my decisions including spending one year studying abroad in Brazil. I am very grateful for their belief in my potential, as well as, for helping me not to give up even in the hardest times. Without their presence and support during this year, it would not be possible to finish such an important stage of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	8
1.1 Background of topic	8
1.2 General and specific objectives	9
1.3 Structure	9
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Cultural Dimensions	11
2.1.1 GLOBE Study	11
2.2 Goal Orientation Theory	14
2.3 Hypothesis Generation	17
3. METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 Procedure	20
3.2 Measurements	20
3.3 Sample	23
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND TESTING HYPOTHESIS	25
4.1 Results	25
4.2 Discussion	30
5. LIMITATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION	32
5.1 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research	32
5.2 Conclusion	33
REFERENCES	35
APPENDIXES	38

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlations of study measures.....	27
Table 2: Results of Hypothesis Tests - Learning Goal Orientation.....	29
Table 3: Results of Hypothesis Tests - Performance Goal Orientation.....	31

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GLOBE: Global Leadership & Organizational Behavior Effectiveness

LGO: Learning Goal Orientation

PGO: Performance Goal Orientation

PO: Performance Orientation

HUA: High Uncertainty Avoidance

HPD: High Power Distance

HIGC: High In-Group Collectivism

IC: Institutional Collectivism

ABSTRACT**“THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURAL DIMENSIONS AND GOAL
ORIENTATION”****By****Madalena Maltês de Almeida Nogueira**

The purpose of this study consists on understanding the relationship between cultural dimensions and goal orientation. Specifically, the research seeks to explore if some cultural dimensions of GLOBE Project are related to goal orientation, specifically Learning and Performance Goal Orientation.

A quantitative research method was used in the study to collect responses from individuals through an online survey previously elaborated. The relationship between five cultural dimensions and Learning and Performance Goal Orientation were tested through multiple linear regressions to understand if there were significant relationships between them and to test if those were positive or negative. The results supported two out of five hypotheses proposed.

Performance Orientation was positively related to Learning Goal Orientation, as well as Institutional Collectivism was negatively related to Performance Goal Orientation. Although the opposite relationship was proposed in the hypothesis, the relationship between High Power Distance and Performance Goal Orientation was significant. Remaining relationships tested did not yield significant findings.

Finally, the results obtained could provide important information about specific cultural behaviors needed to engage with to incur and follow a particular goal orientation, as well as, significant information to future research in this area.

Keywords: Cultural dimensions, Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, Performance Orientation, Institutional Collectivism, In-Group Collectivism, Learning Goal Orientation, Performance Goal Orientation

Paper category: Master's Thesis

RESUMO

O objetivo principal do presente estudo é compreender a relação existente entre dimensões culturais e orientação de resultados. Para além disso, a pesquisa pretende explorar se algumas dimensões culturais propostas pelo GLOBE Study exercem influência na orientação de resultados, especificamente orientação por aprendizagem e performance.

O método de pesquisa utilizado no estudo foi um método quantitativo na forma de um inquérito online previamente elaborado, para recolher as respostas dos participantes. As relações existentes entre cinco dimensões culturais e Orientação de Resultados por Aprendizagem e Performance foram testadas através de regressões lineares múltiplas com o objetivo de perceber se alguma delas era significativa e ao mesmo tempo testar se eram positivas ou negativas. Duas das cinco hipóteses foram suportadas pelos resultados apresentados.

A Orientação por Performance tem uma relação positiva com a Orientação de Resultados por Aprendizagem, assim como o Coletivismo Institucional estabelece uma relação negativa com a Orientação de Resultados por Performance. Apesar de apresentar uma relação oposta àquela prevista na hipótese, a relação que existe entre altos níveis de Distância de Poder e Orientação de Resultados por Performance é significativa. As restantes relações que foram testadas não apresentaram qualquer relevância para o estudo.

Finalmente, os resultados obtidos podem fornecer informações relevantes sobre comportamentos humanos importantes a adoptar para incorrer numa específica orientação de resultados, assim como disponibilizar informação significativa de base para futura pesquisa nesta área.

Palavras chave: Dimensões culturais, Prevenção de Incerteza, Distância de Poder, Orientação por Performance, Coletivismo Institucional, Coletivismo de Grupo, Orientação de Resultados por Aprendizagem, Orientação de Resultados por Performance

Categoria da dissertação: Tese de Mestrado

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of topic

Culture is a worldwide concept very typical of each country, city, or organization. There are many definitions to culture developed across the years, depending on the researcher. Sharing is the focus of those definitions since all of them are related to behaviors, beliefs, values, and so on, experienced by a collective. Culture can be associated with religion, art, values, traditions, familiar structures, societal organization, along with others components, and it has influence in each one. Thus, culture is characterized by diversity because of the number of sub-concepts that carries, as well as defined by dynamic and adaptive considering the adjustment to each country, each person, each company and each dimension.

GLOBE Project defines culture as “shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives that are transmitted across generations.” (Project GLOBE, 1993) According to this study, some dimensions were developed based on measures of societal culture. Those cultural dimensions were evaluated across different countries to allow a large-scale comparison between cultures in diverse parts of the world. The output of the study can be very useful to understand cultural influence on societal and individual mechanisms, organizational practices and common behaviors across the population as well as culture’s orientation.

This better understanding of cultural influences can be applied to figure out how it affects goal orientation. Concerning the globalization lived nowadays at a societal and organizational level, cultural factors can be drivers to orientation choices, managerial implications, and social behaviors discovered through eventually uncover relationships.

One important component of culture’s orientation is the way the society or individuals strive to achieve their goals. Goal orientation manifests internal motivational processes that influence individuals at setting self-goals, choosing tasks, and activating performance or learning mechanisms depending on the context. (Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996) According to the type of goal orientation an individual choose, outcomes will be different. The main divergence between both goals’ components of intellectual achievement, learning and performance, is related to the belief that ability is fixed and uncontrollable, or not. This drive will lead to different kinds of behaviors.

Taking in account that culture is a strong influencer, this research aims to study the relationship between cultural dimensions and goal orientation since different values,

fundamental principles, beliefs, and other cultural aspects could have a significant impact on goal orientation choice. Positive and negative relationships will be established, measured, and tested between Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, Institutional Collectivism, Performance Orientation, and In-Group Collectivism and Learning and Performance Goal Orientation. Those relationships are going to be tested to discover if the choice for a specific goal orientation is influenced by cultural factors. This research will be conducted to answer the main question of the study: *Do cultural dimensions have influence on goal orientation?*

1.2 General and specific objectives

The main objective of the study is expressed by understanding if there is or not a relationship between cultural dimensions and goal orientation, as mentioned above. Each choice that an individual makes during a day is influenced by some value, some person, some rule, along with others. Regarding the strong influence that culture likely has within a society, a relevant choice as goal orientation could be affected by that. Understanding how important cultural influence is among those orientation decisions is a relevant part of the scope of the study.

To achieve the general goal of the study, specific objectives were determined to concretize which relationships should be tested, through correlations and regressions, between cultural dimensions and Learning or Performance Goal Orientation.

Performance Orientation and High Uncertainty Avoidance will be tested to find if there is a positive and negative relationship, respectively, with Learning Goal Orientation. A positive relationship between High Power Distance and Performance Goal Orientation is going to be tested, as well as another two dimensions are going to test their relationships with Performance Goal Orientation. Institutional Collectivism and In-Group Collectivism strive to prove a negative relationship with that goal orientation.

1.3 Structure

Five main chapters compose this thesis. The introductory chapter includes an overview of the topic, an explanation of main reasons to choose it, and which are the general and specific objectives of the study. Chapter 2 illustrates a review of significant literature regarding goal orientation and cultural dimensions. Hypotheses are generated in this chapter according to the results that came up from literature. In chapter three, the methodology of the study is presented: procedures to collect data, applied measures to each item, reliability of measurement scales, and description of sample characteristics. The following chapter analyzes the data collected by the survey and is also focused on testing hypotheses presented

in chapter two. Finally, the fifth chapter came up with the main results and conclusion about the study. Besides that, the chapter also present which were the limitations of the study, major implications, and suggestions for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Cultural Dimensions

2.1.1 GLOBE Study

Robert House founded the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project in 1991, as a research program. This project “became a multi-phase, multi-method, multi sample research project in which investigators spanning the world are examined the interrelationships between societal culture, societal effectiveness and organizational leadership.” (GLOBE Program, 2004) It allows a better understanding of other cultures as well as an effective way of making comparisons between own culture and other countries’ cultures.

The definition of culture is a controversial subject since it is a broad concept that can includes various dimensions and meanings. Javidan and House (2001) defined culture as “shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives that are transmitted across generations.”

To define nine dimensions of societal culture, the first phase of the GLOBE study was based on the recognition and development of societal cultural measures to be analyzed “by conventional psychometric procedures”. (GLOBE Program, 2004) According to House, Javidan and Dorfman (2001), those measures represent two different kinds of cultural manifestations: the agreement existent within members of a collective regarding the attributes covered by the definition of culture; and “the commonality of observed and reported practices of entities such as families, schools, work organizations, economic and legal systems, and political institutions.” (House, Javidan & Dorfman 2001, p.495) To each type of cultural manifestation mentioned above, there are two approaches to measure the cultural attributes chosen. Those are “indicators of shared modal values of collectives” (House, Javidan & Dorfman, 2001, p.495) and modal practices. Concerning first values, they respond to questions in form of judgments (What should be) while the second ones are measured by indicators that determine how “common behaviors, institutional practices, proscriptions and prescriptions” (House, Javidan & Dorfman 2001, p.495) are. The data was collected from 62 countries representing overviews of 17.000 managers.

The nine cultural dimensions identified by GLOBE Study are the following:

- Performance Orientation: The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence.

- Assertiveness: The degree to which individuals are assertive, confrontational and aggressive in their relationships with others.
- Future Orientation: The extent to which individuals engage in future-oriented behaviors such as delaying gratification, planning, and investing in the future.
- Humane Orientation: The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring and kind to others.
- Institutional Collectivism: The degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action.
- In-Group Collectivism: The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families.
- Gender Egalitarianism: The degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequality.
- Power Distance: The degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed equally.
- Uncertainty Avoidance: The extent to which a society, organization, or group relies on social norms, rules, and procedures to alleviate unpredictability of future events.

(House, Javidan & Dorfman, 2001, p.497)

Besides this cultural component, GLOBE Study addresses another subject: types of leadership and related organizational leaders. The research made by the study tries to explain “the extent to which specific leader attributes and behaviors are universally endorsed as contributing to effective leadership, and the extent to which attributes and behaviors are linked to cultural characteristics.” (Javidan & Dastmalchian, 2009, p.47)

Regarding the differences between cultures and leadership styles, GLOBE Study provides static and dynamic information on both of them. One of the static information’s category is related with country and cluster culture information, which means that “the combination of the nine dimensions provides a cultural profile for a country or a cultural cluster.” (Javidan & Dastmalchian, 2009, p.51) In the same way, leadership dominant profile is understandable based on the information available on GLOBE Study. All of the usable data also allows a comparison of two or more countries’ cultural profiles or profiles of outstanding leadership. Javidan and Dastmalchian (2009) consider the other component of information dynamic in nature because “they focus on two relationships among several variables: the relationship between culture and leadership, and the relationship between culture and societal phenomena.” (p.53)

The current study will be focused on five out of nine cultural dimensions: Performance Orientation, Institutional Collectivism, In-Group Collectivism, Power Distance, and Uncertainty Avoidance.

a) Performance Orientation

Performance Orientation is a cultural dimension that “measures how much a country emphasizes the importance for its members to improve and exceed in whatever they do.” (Javidan et al, 2006) Those behaviors are encouraged by the society itself or by organizations and lead people to engage with training and development procedures if the society performs high on this cultural dimension. Hong Kong and New Zealand can shape these kinds of behaviors. (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009, p.45)

On the other hand, there are countries that score low on Performance Orientation demonstrating that family connections and background are more accentuated than all the behaviors mentioned above related to improvement.

b) Institutional Collectivism

The first category of Collectivism is the Institutional one. Institutional because is the society itself that promotes the “collective distribution of resources amongst its members” (Javidan et al, 2006) and reward that as well as collective action. When cultures perform high in Institutional Collectivism, a greater importance is given to the social performance of the country, to group harmony and group rewards than to individual successes, “autonomy, self-interest, and individual freedom”. (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009, p.46)

c) In-Group Collectivism

The second type of Collectivism is the one related with families or organizations being stick with themselves and showing loyalty, pride, and cohesiveness to each other. (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009)

Societies where In-Group Collectivism is a practice, give a huge importance to be part of a group, either family or friends. Even more important than being part of a group is satisfying the expectations of that group’s members. A good example to observe those behaviors of a typical In-Group collective culture is China. (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009) As opposite, cultures where the index of In-Group Collectivism is low, do not give any special treatment or importance to being part of a group not even a family member. In these cultures is also

common to “people do not feel obliged to ignore rules to take care of their close friends and family members.” (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009, p.495)

d) Power Distance

According to the GLOBE Project (2004), Power Distance refers to the level of acceptance and endorsement of authority, power differences, and status privileges within an organization or society. When the index of Power Distance is high, the expectation is that power should be unequally shared. In those kinds of countries, people with power and status are differentiated from people without it and “expect obedience towards superiors.” (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009, p.47) Russia and Brazil are examples of societies high in Power Distance.

At an organizational level, decisions are made by superiors and communicated to employees as instructions to be followed passively and without being questioned. Thus it is possible to observe vertical communication among organizations that creates a gap between superiors and employees since the second ones have a submissive attitude and have no space for their own opinions. (Khatri, 2009, p.7)

On the other hand, less differentiation is supposed to happen between people with and without power at societies performing low in Power Distance. Developed countries such as Denmark and the Netherlands are examples of these societies. (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009, p.47)

e) Uncertainty Avoidance

As Javidan and Dastmalchian wrote in 2009, Uncertainty Avoidance is a cultural dimension related with the extent that a society or organization strive to avoid uncertainty through social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices. These tools are used to “alleviate the unpredictability of future events.” (House, Javidan & Dorfman, 2001, p.495) As bigger is the intention to avoid uncertainty, “more people seek orderliness, consistency, structure, formal procedures, and laws to cover situations in their daily lives.” (GLOBE Project 2004) At the opposite extreme, cultures that have low scores on this dimension are not so worried about following rules, choose less structured lifestyles and demonstrate a strong tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity. (Javidan & Dastmalchian 2009)

2.2 Goal Orientation Theory

“Goal Orientation reflects both self-development beliefs and how these beliefs lead individuals to interpret and engage with their environment.” (Hirst, Knippenberg & Zhou,

2009, p.281) Internal motivational processes are one drive to influence personal choices regarding tasks, self-goals, and effort mechanisms taking in account learning and performance contexts. (Button et. al, 1996)

Usually two distinct dimensions are identified within Goal Orientation: Learning Goal Orientation (LGO) concerned with develop competence and task mastery, and Performance Goal Orientation (PGO) related to showing competence to others.

Learning Goal Orientation and Performance Goal Orientation

According to Dweck and Legget (1988), there are two orientations regarding the achievement of goals: Learning Goal Orientation and Performance Goal Orientation. They believed that people follow one of those orientations depending on their belief if ability is a fixed or malleable attribute.

For incremental theorists, ability is considered a malleable characteristic that is why they believe that is possible strengthening it through effort and learning. (Dweck & Legget, 1988) In this case, individuals tend to adopt a Learning Goal Orientation which implies be focused on developing a competence through learning. In contrast, entity theorists usually adopt Performance Goal Orientation since they do not believe that ability can be enhanced as a result of learning and effort. Those type of theorists are focused on demonstrate competence because of the judgment and evaluation of others, rather than develop their competences since they consider ability a fixed and non-malleable attribute. (Dweck & Legget, 1988)

The framework presented by Dweck and Legget associates mastery-oriented behaviors to Learning Goal Orientation and helplessness behaviors to Performance Goal Orientation. Individuals who follow a Learning Goal Orientation are characterized for seeking challenges and for increasing their competences, for using effective task strategy, for trying to understand new insights or came up with something new, and for having high initiation and persistence of effort. (Dweck & Legget, 1988)

Regarding individuals that adopt a Performance Goal Orientation, specific behaviors are usually observed: risk and challenge avoidance, a low persistence of effort, search for supportive judgments and avoidance of negative evaluations of individuals' competence, and less effective task strategy. (Dweck & Legget, 1988)

Finally, Dweck and Legget (1988) considered that Learning Goal Orientation and Performance Goal Orientation were mutually exclusive, which means that people were focused just on one of those orientations. Some researchers did not agree with this point of view thus proposed alternative models that still came up from Dweck and Leggett's

framework. According to that framework, goal orientation reflects a pattern of stable behaviors and is considered a motivational trait.

Two-Factor Model of Goal Orientation - Button, Mathieu, and Zajac (1996)

According to Button et. al. (1996) studies, “theory of ability is positively correlated with Learning Goal Orientation and negatively correlated with Performance Goal Orientation” (Button et. al, 1996. P.37). Those researchers also examined the relationship between self-esteem and locus of control with goal orientation. As results, they found that self-esteem, feedback-seeking tendencies, and internal locus of control have a positive relationship with Learning Goal Orientation that stimulates mastery-oriented responses. “The mastery-oriented response pattern involves seeking challenging tasks and maintaining effective striving under difficult conditions.” (Button et. al, 1996. p.26) On the other hand, Performance Goal Orientation positively connects with fear of negative evaluation, external locus of control, competitiveness, and an entity theory of ability. This type of orientation leads to vulnerability to a maladaptive helpless pattern. (Button et. al, 1996)

The developed framework by Button, Mathieu and Zajac in 1996 consisted in a multidimensional construct with eight items to measure each dimension: Learning and Performance Goal Orientation. (Appendix 1) This framework is called 2 Factor Model of Goal Orientation. Depending on each orientation, items were written in a different way. For Learning Goal Orientation, items should “reflect a desire to engage in challenging activities, an eagerness to improve oneself, and a tendency to use one’s past performance as a standard to evaluate current performance.” (Button et. al, 1996, p.32) Regarding Performance Goal Orientation items, it expresses a “preference for non-challenging activities, a desire to avoid mistakes, and a tendency to evaluate performance by normative standards.” (Button et. al, 1996, p.32)

Lastly, Button et. al (1996) considered that both dimensions were not mutually exclusive nor contradictory. They supported the idea that “is possible for an individual to simultaneously strive to improve one’s skills and to perform relative to others.” (Button et. al, 1996, p.28)

Three-Factor Model of Goal Orientation - VandeWalle (1997)

The framework developed by VandeWalle in 1997 was also a multidimensional construct but with 3 dimensions: Learning Goal Orientation (LGO), Performance Prove Goal Orientation (PPGO) and Performance Avoid Goal Orientation (PAGO). 3 Factor Model of Goal Orientation was composed by 5 items to measure LGO, 4 items to measure PPGO and finally another 4 items to measure PAGO.

VandeWalle had the necessity to dichotomized Performance Goal Orientation into Performance Prove Goal Orientation as a “desire to prove one’s competence and to gain favorable judgments about it” (VandeWalle & Cummings 1997, p.394), and into Performance Avoid Goal Orientation (PAGO) representing the desire to avoid negative judgments or evaluations of competence. (VandeWalle & Cummings 1997)

Since VandeWalle’s framework was specifically directed to use in work settings, it is not going to be explored or tested because the study focuses on society as a whole and not only organizational context.

2.3 Hypothesis Generation

The main objective of the study consists on understanding if there is any relationship between cultural dimensions and goal orientation. Depending on core characteristics of each cultural dimension, the engagement with a Learning or Performance Goal Orientation could be influenced by the type of culture lived in a specific society.

The most valorized behaviors by Performance Orientation dimension are the improvement of individuals’ performance as well as reaching excellence in everything they do. Javidan and Dastmalchian (2009) presented some typical values of this dimension: improving and rewarding performance, being innovative, and looking for challenging goals. Those values were based on the need for achievement and continuous improvement.

One of the core characteristics of Learning Goal Orientation is the development of competence and task mastery by individuals through a learning experience. Learning-oriented individuals continuously seek for information and for challenging and demanding tasks to acquire more knowledge and skills and consequently achieve excellence and dominate the mastery of challenging tasks. Training and development procedures usually emphasized by Performance Orientation dimension likely induce to develop and improve processing strategies to facilitate task mastery, as well as, the need for achievement leads to a more intensive engagement with the task and could impulse intrinsic motivation. Moreover, being innovative conducts to uncertain and untried approaches which increase the likelihood of error, typical of a Learning Goal Orientation.

The essence of Performance Orientation at exceeding and develop performance through a challenging and innovative way could be positively related with some behaviors such as investing high effort on tasks while desire a continuous improvement of knowledge, challenging goals, skills, mastery through learning, and competence.

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between Performance Orientation and Learning Goal Orientation.

Learning Goal Orientation tends to follow behaviors that a culture averse to uncertainty likely rejects. The incessant search for new knowledge, challenges, and information along with the desire to try new procedures leads to untried and uncertain approaches, which increase the unpredictability of future events. Those characteristics of LGO demonstrate a significant tolerance for uncertainty because the process of learning implies an acceptance of possible failure and contact with the unknown. The need of having rules, laws, elaborated procedures, and structured lifestyles defined are not likely to influence individuals to engage with a goal orientation that relies on the opposite values. The predictability and consistency of situations and the detail expected from each routine or strategy keep way this type of goal orientation and high levels of Uncertainty Avoidance. At those higher levels of UA, few unexpected events occurred and there are procedures and structures to ensure a predictable development of events at different dimensions of the society. Those characteristics along with the ones mentioned above conduct to a high intolerance to uncertainty and unexpected events. Taking in account regular behaviors of LGO, a negative relationship with the cultural dimension could be patent since higher levels of UA do not likely influence individuals to always seek for challenging tasks to achieve mastery or risk the predictability of events just to improve competence through learning, knowledge and skill acquisition instead of stick to predictable processes and procedures.

Hypothesis 2: There is a negative relationship between higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance and Learning Goal Orientation.

Following instructions or orders from superiors without a chance to have own opinion and accept inequality as a normal standard, consist in two major components of cultures performing high levels of Power Distance. Regarding the obedience that individuals should show to their superiors and the need to achieve demanded outcomes in cultures with high levels of Power Distance, judgments and evaluation of others are very important as well as showing competence and results to superiors. In those cultures is likely that individuals avoid mistakes and risky challenges because they fear not performing well, they want to prove their competence and finally, they do not want to fail.

Those behaviors could encourage individuals to engage in a Performance Goal Orientation establishing a positive relationship between those two dimensions. To improve performance in a culture that scored high levels of Power Distance is probable that external outcomes and

rewards associated with performance motivate individuals since they do not expect changes in power distribution either opportunity to decide innovative or challenging ways to improve performance. The likelihood of individuals to engage with a Performance Goal Orientation is bigger in those conditions observed at high levels of Power Distance.

Hypothesis 3: Higher levels of Power Distance are positively correlated with Performance Goal Orientation.

In-Group Collectivism and Institutional Collectivism are two dimensions related to the cultural organization of societies or institutions. Although the differences between those two dimensions, core aspects are related with being part of a group, prioritize needs and goals of the group, strive for approval of the others, distribute resources equally, concerning with the social performance of the country as group where individuals belong, and promote group harmony even if individual goals suffer. Societies performing high in collectivistic practices have a robust orientation towards focusing on others and their goals. Therefore, it is plausible that they would view the self as flexible because, in order to meet the goals and needs of the group, one needs to lose and shape self-identity accordingly. (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) This kind of attitude typical from a collectively oriented individual demonstrates a high tolerance for inconsistencies in behaviors and attitudes (Norenzayan et al., 1999), as well as flexibility to adopt new attitudes or to improve themselves.

In a society that engages in Performance Goal Orientation, the ability of individuals is seen as non-malleable and fixed. Individuals avoid risky situations as well as incur on mistakes since the focus is the performance showed to others and the concern to not engage in high levels of learning. Based on those fundamentals, it is likely that the relationship between cultural dimensions related to collectivism and Performance Goal Orientation be negative.

Hypothesis 4: Higher levels of In-group Collectivist are negatively related to Performance Goal Orientation.

Hypothesis 5: There is a negative relationship between Institutional Collectivist and Performance Goal Orientation.

3. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the methodology used to conduct the study will be presented and explained. In addition, components of the data collection process such as measures for each variable, sample attributes, and general collection procedures will be described.

3.1 Procedure

The main purpose of the study relies on understanding the relationship that exists between cultural dimensions and goal orientation. A quantitative study was conducted since “the intent is to establish, confirm, or validate relationships and to develop generalizations that contribute to theory”. (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001, p. 102) To adopt quantitative methods, “strategies of inquiry such as experimental and surveys” (Creswell, 2003, p.18) were introduced, and “data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data” was collected. (Creswell, 2003, p.18) The method chosen to collect data was a quantitative survey assigned online via social media since nowadays it is the best channel to reach a considerable amount of people in short term. In addition this channel also allows collecting responses from both demographically diverse and geographically distinct respondents. In order to get honest and unbiased answers, the survey was anonymous and self-administered by each respondent, while having the possibility to abandon its completion at any time. The survey was available in Portuguese and English to cover a wide range of possible respondents and ensure the understanding of all of them. In average, each questionnaire took 4.37 minutes to be completed.

Regarding its structure, the survey was composed by 41 closed-ended questions, 16 related to goal orientation theory (8 to LGO and 8 to PGO), 20 correspondent to five dimensions of GLOBE Study, and 5 demographic questions. Excluding the latter 5 questions, all items were measured with a seven-point Likert scale. All scales used as instruments to measure those variables came from academic literature review. Respondents were appealed to answer according to their own behaviors as well according to the society where they live.

Qualitrics, the online survey tool used is fully compatible with diverse data analysis software including STATA, which allows exporting the results to get the database to the study. In order to analyze results and generate conclusions, STATA13 was the chosen software. The survey used for this study is available in Appendix 1.

3.2 Measurements

Two main subjects were measured across the questionnaire: goal orientation and cultural dimensions. Relying on the existent literature, two different scales explained in detail in the following paragraphs, were used for each subject. Besides that, demographic data such as

gender, age, nationality, education level and annual income were also collected to control differences between participants.

Learning Goal Orientation

Learning Goal Orientation was measured through the survey by eight items. Those items were part of the 2 Factor Model of Goal Orientation developed by Button et. al (1996) and were rated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1, for “strongly agree” to 7 for “strongly disagree”. Sample Learning Goal Orientations items included “The opportunity to learn new things is important to me” and “When I have difficulty solving a problem, I enjoy trying different approaches to see which one will work”. The reliability of this scale was tested and ensured since its Cronbach’s alpha is 0.7928. The acceptable indicator for alpha used to be 0.7. (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011)

Performance Goal Orientation

Performance Goal Orientation was measured by a set of eight items with a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for “strongly agree” to 7 for “strongly disagree”. Similarly to Learning Goal Orientation, the scale used was from 2 Factor Model of Goal Orientation, a 16-item measure developed by Button et. al (1996).

Sample Performance Goal Orientation items included “I like to work on tasks that I have done well on in the past” and “The opinions others have about how well I do certain things are important to me.” The reported Cronbach’s alpha was 0.7241, thus, scale reliability was ensured.

Uncertainty Avoidance

The scale used to measure Uncertainty Avoidance was developed by the GLOBE Project through the research survey phase 2 beta in 2006. For this dimension there were four questions rated with a seven-point Likert scale, for three of which 1 was “strongly agree” and 7 “strongly disagree”, while for the remaining one, 1 was “almost all situations” and 7 “very few situations”. Sample Uncertainty Avoidance items included “In this society, most people lead highly structured lives with few unexpected events” and “In this society, societal requirements and instructions are spelled out in detail so citizens know what they are expected to do”. High Uncertainty Avoidance is a categorical variable in which individuals that scored above the mean (2,915) were coded as 1 and individuals that scored below the mean were coded as 0.

Institutional Collectivism

Institutional Collectivism was addressed by a set of four items collected from GLOBE Project's survey. The second and fourth questions rated the levels of this dimension through a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for "individual interests" and 7 for "collective interests" at the second item, and 1 for "group cohesion is more value than individualism" and 7 for "individualism is more value than group cohesion" at the fourth. The remaining items also considered a seven-point Likert scale where 1 represented "strongly agree" and 7 "strongly disagree". Sample Institutional Collectivism items included "In this society, being accepted by the other members of a group is very important" and "In this society, leaders encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer". Finally it is important to refer that the first, third, and fourth items demanded a reverse code, which means that the numerical scoring scale runs in the opposite direction. Those items were reversed as suggested by GLOBE Project. (GLOBE Foundation, 2006)

In-Group Collectivism

In-Group Collectivism included four items that use a seven-point Likert scale, 1 for "strongly agree" and 7 for "strongly disagree" to measure the perception that individuals have of this dimension among their society. Those items belong to the GLOBE Project's survey developed in 2006. Sample In-Group Collectivism items include "In this society, children take pride in the individual accomplishments of their parents" and "In this society, aging parents generally live at home with their children". All of the items were reversed to represent the construct of In-Group Collectivism. (GLOBE Foundation, 2006) In-Group Collectivism presented a mean of 4,987. High In-Group Collectivism is a categorical variable in which individuals that scored above the mean were coded as 1 while the ones that scored below the mean were coded as 0.

Power Distance

This dimension comprehended different types of answers amongst its five items. As well as other dimensions already presented above, those items came from the survey of GLOBE Project phase 2 beta. Across all items, a seven-point Likert scale was used with different meanings from 1 to 7. Item one defined 1 for "one's ability and contribution to society" and 7 for "the authority of one's position"; item two designated 1 for "obey their leaders without question" and 7 for "question their leaders when in disagreement". For the following item, 1 was "increase their social distance from less powerful individuals" and 7 "decrease their social distance from less powerful individuals". Sample Power Distance items included "In

this society, rank and position in the hierarchy have special privileges”. Item number four described 1 as “strongly agree” and 7 as “strongly disagree”. Finally, the last item designated 1 to “concentrated at the top” and 7 to “shared throughout the society”. Regarding this dimension, only the first item was not reverse coded. The remaining items were reversed as suggested by GLOBE Project. (GLOBE Foundation, 2006) High Power Distance is a categorical variable in which individuals that scored above the mean (5) were coded as 1 and individuals that scored below the mean were coded as 0.

Performance Orientation

Similarly, for this dimension, a different definition for 1 and 7, from a seven-point Likert scale, was considered for each item. All three items integrated the GLOBE Project’s survey. The first item weighted 1 as “strongly agree” and 7 as “strongly disagree”, the second item defined 1 as “only performance effectiveness” and 7 as “only factors other than performance effectiveness (for example, seniority or political connections)”, and finally, for the third item, 1 was “substantially rewarded” and 7 “not rewarded”. Sample Performance Orientation items included “In this society, teen-aged students are encouraged to strive for continuously improved performance”. The three items were reversed as suggested by GLOBE Study. (GLOBE Foundation, 2006)

Regarding the reliability of scales used by GLOBE Study, tests were made to find out the value of Cronbach’s alpha to each dimension. As already mentioned above, measures are considered reliable when alpha is, at least, 0.7. (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011)

In this case, for all the GLOBE dimensions, the reliability coefficient was below 0.7: Uncertainty Avoidance = 0.6683; Institutional Collectivism = 0.6169; In-Group Collectivism = 0.3356; Power Distance = 0.6220; Performance Orientation = 0.5276. However, those scales were validated by the previously mentioned GLOBE Study and accepted by many researchers around the world. Therefore, none of the dimensions were removed in order to increase the reliability of the study since all were accepted as reliable.

3.3 Sample

A sample of 120 responses was gathered by a questionnaire produced using an online survey software, Qualitrics. However, it was essential to have relevant data in order to retain and

strengthen the validity of results. That is why incomplete questionnaires were not taken into account and just 94 from the 120 questionnaires, the completed quota, were considered.¹

The majority of individuals that contributed to the study were women, accounting for 58.51% of the total sample, while the most outstanding age group among overall respondents was individuals under 30 years old (52.13%). Both remaining age groups registered similar percentages: 24.47% for individuals between 31 and 50 years old, and 23.40% for individuals above 50 years old. Regarding education level, 25.53% stated having a master degree while, at least, 59.57% finished a bachelor degree. Finally, 85.11% of the sample was constituted by Portuguese people besides German, Italian, Spanish, Brazilian, British and Ukrainian respondents.

The survey collected data from March 23th to April 26th, 2018.

¹ All tests were run with participants that dropped the survey and the results were the same. Therefore, the results that not include those participants are the only ones presented.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND TESTING HYPOTHESIS

In this chapter, information gathered from the survey will be presented, data will be analyzed, and a discussion about results performed. Besides that, by using results that came up from data analysis, hypotheses are going to be tested and consequently accepted or rejected. Collected data was extracted from the survey to be statistically analyzed using the software STATA 13.

In the following sections is possible to observe the findings in detail and respective analysis. In order to show the main characteristics of the sample, descriptive statistics were presented and correlations were tested to study and explain the strength of relationships between variables. Along with those measures, multiple linear regressions were also used to test relationships among variables.

4.1 Results

This research aims to understand the relationship between cultural dimensions and goal orientation, specifically prove if there is a positive or negative influential relationship among some dimensions and particular goal orientations.

Descriptive statistics such as the number of respondents, mean, and standard deviation, as well bivariate Pearson's correlations and Cronbach Alphas of study measures are presented in Table 1. Variables 8, 9, and 10 identify individuals with high levels of those respective characteristics, which means, the ones that scored above mean.

In first place is possible to observe that neither Performance Orientation nor High Uncertainty Avoidance have a significant correlation with Learning Goal Orientation ($r = .135$ and $r = .022$, respectively, $p > .05$).

Secondly, regarding Performance Goal Orientation, significant and not significant correlations were established. As it is possible to observe, the correlation between Institutional Collectivism and Performance Goal Orientation is significant and negative ($r = -.297$, $p < .05$). The correlation between High Power Distance and Performance Goal Orientation is also worth to mention due to its significance ($r = -.267$, $p < .05$). In the same way as the previously correlation mentioned, those two dimensions are negatively related. Oppositely, High In-Group Collectivism presented a non-significant relationship with Performance Goal Orientation ($r = -.066$, $p > .05$).

Finally, after this preliminary analysis is possible to gather first evidence to support or not support research hypotheses. Cultural dimensions referred in hypothesis 1 (Performance Orientation), 2 (Uncertainty Avoidance), and 4 (In-Group Collectivism) presented non-

significant correlations with respective goal orientation, providing a first evidence that these hypotheses are not supported. Although the relationship proposed by hypothesis 3 demonstrates a significant correlation, the effect observed is the opposite mentioned in the hypothesis. Therefore, using this first evidence, hypothesis 3 is not supported. Similar to hypothesis 3, a significant and negative relationship is present between Institutional Collectivism and Performance Goal Orientation, as proposed in hypothesis 5. Therefore, there is evidence to support this hypothesis.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations of study measures

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Learning Goal Orientation	94	1,721	0,514	(0.793)								
2. Performance Goal Orientation	94	2,415	0,749	-0,055	(0.724)							
3. Uncertainty Avoidance	94	2,915	1,092	0,028	0,138	(0.668)						
4. Institutional Collectivism	94	4,215	1,371	-0,015	-0.297*	-0.355*	(0.617)					
5. In-group Collectivism	94	4,987	0,728	-0,194	-0,082	0,104	0.225*	(0.336)				
6. Power Distance	94	5,000	1,521	0,081	-0,188	-0,039	-0,103	-0,015	(0.622)			
7. Performance Orientation	94	3,358	1,073	0,135	0,052	0.3092*	-0.289*	-0,130	0.237*	(0.528)		
8. High Power Distance	94	-	-	-0,008	-0.267*	-0,026	-0,079	0,012	0.814*	0.235*	-	
9. High Uncertainty Avoidance	94	-	-	0,022	0,147	0.800*	-0.234*	0,113	-0,042	0,145	-0,040	-
10. High In-group Collectivism	94	-	-	-0,130	-0,066	0,092	0,186	0.822*	-0,090	-0,161	-0,077	0,105

Notes: ** $p < .05$; Cronbach Alpha in parentheses.

Multiple linear regressions were run to test the relationship between Performance Orientation and High Uncertainty Avoidance with LGO. In Table 2 is possible to observe the models that tested hypothesis 1 (model 2 and 3) and hypothesis 2 (model 4 and 5) that will be explained in the following paragraphs.

Model 1 just included control variables such as gender, age, nationality, income, and education, being present only to exhibit the results of the model evaluation (R^2 , F, and VIF). The model shows that 18.7% of variance in Learning Goal Orientation is explained by participant's demographic characteristics ($R^2 = .187$). Moreover, the variance inflation factor (VIF) also revealed a plausible value ($VIF = 1.76$) since it was minor than the suggested value of 5 (Hair et al., 2011).

Both model 2 and 3 were run to test hypothesis 1. Model 2 included no more than Performance Orientation being tested related to Learning Goal Orientation, while model 3 besides Performance Orientation included control variables. Hypothesis 1 predicted that the relationship between Performance Orientation and Learning Goal Orientation will be positive. The results collected from Model 3 give support to hypothesis 1, since the coefficient is significant and positive ($\beta = .133$, $p < .05$). As mentioned before, is possible to observe on Table 2 that when Performance Orientation was tested without demographic control variables,

the effect was not significant ($\beta = .064$, $p > .05$). The effect became significant when those controls were included. The results from model 3, including controls, allow the model to hold constant individual's characteristics along the participants, and therefore, lead to a more precise estimator of the explanatory variable (Performance Orientation) in which the effect of individual characteristics is not encompassed.

Further, VIF of model 3 showed that there was no evidence that the correlation between independent variables affected the result of the estimator (VIF Mean = 1.73; VIF Max = 2.48) since this indicator presented a value smaller than the one suggested (VIF < 5). The amount of variance explained by model 3 was 25.1% ($R^2 = 0.251$), higher than the model including only control variables (Model 1) and which is an acceptable indicator for social sciences.

Therefore, there was evidence to support Hypothesis 1: *There is a positive relationship between Performance Orientation and Learning Goal Orientation.*

In Table 2 is also possible to observe model 4 and 5 that tested hypothesis 2 which predicted a negative relationship between higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance and Learning Goal Orientation. Linear regressions revealed a non-significant positive relationship between those two dimensions.

Likely to the first two models, model 4 just included High Uncertainty Avoidance while model 5 incorporated both High Uncertainty Avoidance and demographic controls. From one model to another, there was no difference in the significance of correlations ($\beta = .023$; $\beta = .092$, $p > .05$). Consequently, there is no evidence that highest levels of Uncertainty Avoidance are related to Learning Goal Orientation. Presenting the value of VIF (VIF Mean = 1.76; VIF Max = 2.34) is worthy since the correlation between independent variables was not higher than the suggested (VIF < 5) so it seems that not influenced the estimator of the effect of High Uncertainty Avoidance in Learning Goal Orientation. Then, there was no evidence to support Hypothesis 2: *There is a negative relationship between higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance and Learning Goal Orientation.*

Table 2. Results of Hypothesis Tests - Learning Goal Orientation

DV: Learning Goal Orientation	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Performance Orientation		0,064 (0.050)	0.133* (0.054)		
High Uncertainty Avoidance				0,023 (0.106)	0,092 (0.107)
Constant (b0)	1.874*** (0.130)	1.505*** (0.185)	1.449*** (0.210)	1.710*** (0.076)	1.841*** (0.146)
R2	0,187	0,018	0,251	0,001	0,194
F	3,105	1,655	3,657	0,047	2,855
VIF	1,76	-	1,73	-	1,76
Degrees of Freedom	10, 83	1, 92	11, 82	1, 92	11, 82
Gender	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Age	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Nationality	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Income	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Education	yes	no	yes	no	yes

Notes: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$; Robust standard errors in parentheses; N=94 observations in all models; DV = dependent variable

In Table 3 is possible to observe the results of hypotheses 3, 4 and 5, which predict the relationship between High Power Distance, High In-Group Collectivism, and Institutional Collectivism with Performance Goal Orientation.

Similar to Table 2, model 1 just tested variables of control (gender, age, nationality, income, and education) and was included only to present the results of the model evaluation ($R^2 = .091$; $F = 4.420$; $VIF = 1.76$). Those indicators demonstrated a good fit of the model and VIF revealed an acceptable value ($VIF < 5$).

Model 2 and 3 were managed to test hypothesis 3, the relationship between higher levels of Power Distance and Performance Goal Orientation. This hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between the dimensions mentioned above. Model 2 included solely High Power Distance, while model 3 besides High Power Distance included control variables. Both of them showed significant and negative ($\beta = -.398$, $p < .05$; $\beta = -.326$, $p < .05$, respectively) impact of High Power Distance in Performance Goal Orientation. Thereby, the results were constant between models 2 and 3, presenting a negative and significant relationship.

Additionally, VIF of model 3 exhibited no evidence that the correlation between independent variables affected the result demonstrated by the model ($VIF \text{ Mean} = 1.74$; $VIF \text{ Max} = 2.48$) once this indicator performed an acceptable value ($VIF < 5$). Observing R^2 is possible to conclude that 13.2% of the variance of Performance Goal Orientation was explained by model 3 ($R^2 = .132$), a higher level of explanation of Performance Goal Orientation than the model only including the control variables (model 1).

Therefore, there was evidence to reject hypothesis 3 because although the significance of the correlation between variables, the effect is negative and not positive as suggested in Hypothesis 3: *Higher levels of Power Distance are positively correlated with Performance Goal Orientation.*

Both model 4 and 5 presented in Table 3 were run to test hypothesis 4. A prediction about a negative relationship between higher levels of In-Group Collectivism and Performance Goal Orientation were made by this hypothesis. The regression analysis disclosed a negative relationship between those two dimensions.

Model 4 just contemplated High In-Group Collectivism effects, while model 5 took into account both High In-Group Collectivism and control demographic variables. The correlation between Performance Goal Orientation and High In-Group Collectivism presented by model 5 was negative and not significant ($\beta = -.094$, $p > .05$). The significance of the results did not change when including control variables.

Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) did not present evidence of any influence on results caused by existing correlations between independent variables (VIF Mean = 1.73; VIF Max = 2.36) since it was smaller than the one suggested (VIF <5). It is also possible to observe that the difference between R^2 of model 1 ($R^2 = .091$) and model 5 ($R^2 = .094$) is small, which means that including the effect of High In-Group Collectivism along with the controls did not contribute to increasing the amount of variation explained of Performance Goal Orientation.

So, there was no evidence to support hypothesis 4 since the effect is not significant. Hypothesis 4 was rejected: *Higher levels of In-group Collectivist are positively related with Performance Goal Orientation.*

Finally, model 6 and 7 were conducted to test hypothesis 5 which predicted a negative relationship between Institutional Collectivism and Performance Goal Orientation. The results exposed a negative and significant relationship.

As previous models, model 6 was constituted just by Institutional Collectivism, as long as model 7 included both Institutional Collectivism and control variables.

The results demonstrated by Model 7 gave support to hypothesis 5, once the relationship between Performance Goal Orientation and Institutional Collectivism was significant and negative ($\beta = -.182$, $p < .001$). As showed in Table 3, the results were stable although the inclusion of control variables.

Further, the value of VIF demonstrated no evidence that the correlation between independent variables affected the result of model 7 (VIF Mean = 1.7; VIF Max =2.31) since the indicator

was above the recommended value (VIF <5). About 19.6% of PGO's variance was explained by model 7, which is an admissible value for social sciences. Moreover, Institutional Collectivism by itself explained 8.8% of the variance in PGO.

Consequently, there was enough evidence to support Hypothesis 5: *There is a negative relationship between Institutional Collectivism and Performance Goal Orientation.*

Table 3. Results of Hypothesis Tests - Performance Goal Orientation

DV: Performance Goal Orientation	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
High Power Distance		-0.398** (.151)	-0.326* (.158)				
High In-group Collectivism				-0.102 (.166)	-.094 (.173)		
Institutional Collectivism						-0.162** (.053)	-0.182*** (.055)
Constant (b0)	1.916*** (.233)	2.622*** (.118)	2.184*** (.246)	2.479*** (.137)	1.961*** (.257)	3.097*** (.248)	2.618*** (.340)
R2	0,091	0,071	0,132	0,004	0,094	0,088	0,196
F	4,420	6,940	4,030	0,380	3,180	9,190	5,200
VIF	1,760	-	1,74	-	1,73	-	1,7
Degrees of Freedom	10, 83	1, 92	11, 82	1, 92	11, 82	1, 92	11, 82
Gender	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Age	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Nationality	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Income	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Education	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes

Notes: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001; Robust standard errors in parentheses; N=94 observations in all models; DV = dependent variable

4.2 Discussion

After analyzing the results, it is possible to conclude that Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 5 were accepted but remaining results proved to be different than expected. Performance Orientation demonstrated a positive and significant relationship with Learning Goal Orientation since each time Performance Orientation increases 1 point, Learning Goal Orientation increases .133 points. In Institutional Collectivism case, each time this dimension increases 1 point, Performance Goal Orientation decreases .182 points, as expected in Hypothesis 5.

Regarding High Power Distance (Hypothesis 3), it was possible to observe that individuals included in this category presented reduced levels of Performance Goal Orientation comparing with participants performing low in PGO. A possible explanation for this occurrence could be that individuals with high power distance do not prioritize the outcome of their performance since they know that even if they increase performance levels, their position in society or/and organization is not changing, since the power is distributed unequally and people accepted like it is without expecting changes based on performance.

Concerning hypothesis 4 that suggested a negative relationship between High In-Group Collectivism and Performance Goal Orientation, results gathered shows that an individual performing high levels at In-Group Collectivism does not have an effect in PGO, which means there is not a relevant influence of the cultural dimension at engagement with a Performance Goal Orientation. A possible explanation is that the concern about the group may lead the individuals to prioritize cohesion over judgments regarding the performance of each member.

Similar to hypothesis 4, hypothesis 2, relating higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance with LGO, is not supported. When participants are high in Uncertainty Avoidance, they reach the same level of LGO, on average, than participants low in Uncertainty Avoidance. A possible reason is that, when participants' culture highly desire to avoid uncertainty, they tend to avoid the uncertainty of not knowing, or of being less competitive, and therefore, they are still willing to orientate their selves to learning. The afraid of making mistakes and dealing with the unknown that individuals performing High Uncertainty Avoidance experience, seems to be not determinant to have an influence on LGO, which means that as well as they avoid uncertainty, they also could engage in learning processes to diminish the level of what they do not know.

Overall, it seems that there is a relationship between some aspects of cultural dimensions and goal orientation. Performance Orientation seems to increase a goal orientation to learn, meanwhile higher levels of Power Distance and Institutional Collectivism decreases goal orientation to performance. However, the results suggest that higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance are not related to a change in Learning Goal Orientation, as well as higher levels of In-Group Collectivism do not demonstrate changes at Performance Goal Orientation levels..

5. LIMITATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, limitations of the study will be exposed as well recommendations for future research coming from those limitations. A brief conclusion of the dissertation will be also presented.

5.1 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

After concluding the research, a few limitations were identified and presented in the following paragraphs.

One limitation easily identified was the size of the sample that was relatively small since quantitative methods were used. Some participants did not finish the survey what contributed to decreasing the final number of answers. The collection of more data was not possible due to time constraints, collaboration of participants, the extent of the questionnaire, and lack of means to reach people from different countries around the world. Before conducting this research, analyze cultural dimensions and its influence on goal orientation was an objective taking into account different nationalities. However, 85.11% of the respondents were Portuguese that is why was not possible to test each dimension by nationality. It could be interesting for future research, repeat this study gathering results from a significant number of participants from different countries because final results can diverge a lot from the ones got, and could have a relevant importance for managerial purposes.

A second limitation concerns that the data collected was self-reported, which means that the reliability of results could be affected by the common method bias. It is important to be aware of this limitation since biased answers might affect the relevance of the study. Although the need for self-report data for this study, in future research running an experiment or using longitudinal data are some suggestions to decrease biased results. These recommendations could also be important for another limitation related to the attention that respondents paid to the survey. There were slight differences on statements whose interpretations could have been compromised because of a lack of attention. Another recommendation for future research avoids this limitation is that the surveys should include a few questions saying for respondents do not answer to those specific items, and afterwards take that into consideration when analyzing the results.

Besides the effect on the reliability of results, common method bias may have been exaggerated the size of relationships between variables. This fact could happened because participants answered in a socially desirable manner, because of the need to remain consistent for themselves, and also because they wanted to demonstrate their theories about the topic

currently in study. One of the ways to try to contour this limitation is to keep the identity of the respondents anonymous.

The fact that only a quantitative research method was applied to collect data can be another limitation of the study. Misunderstandings of questions or dimensions definitions were not possible to explain through a quantitative process which could compromise the results and made it difficult to understand the relationship established between variables. For future research, using a method that combines both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data could fit better in the study.

Another limitation is related to the scales that were used to test hypotheses among the study. Those scales were taken from other academic and research papers that are why may not have been the perfect fit for the current study.

Finally, although the amount of literature available regarding cultural dimensions and goal orientation separately, there was not a huge amount of literature connecting both subjects. This could be considered a limitation once may be considered a factor responsible for the non-significance of some results.

5.2 Conclusion

The importance of culture on individuals' behaviors and attitudes is clearly supported by cross-cultural literature. On another side, there is huge the relevance and impact that goal orientation has in a society as a mean of availability to learn, defining ambitions, determine managerial attitudes, and demonstrate performance. Previous research available about the influence that specific cultural dimensions could have on goal orientation was not abundant nor covered all of those dimensions. The aim of the study was exactly that one, understand if there was any influence and test specific cultural dimensions related with LGO and PGO.

From five hypotheses, the positive relationship between Performance Orientation and LGO, and the negative relationship between Institutional Collectivism and PGO were significant and accepted after being tested.

Understand the importance of cultural dimensions' influence on goal orientation could be really relevant because those relationships are likely to show to managers, politicians, families' chiefs that depending on different cultures of individuals, different goal orientation are going to be engaging by them. For future research in this topic, an interesting insight could be achieved by measure those cultural dimensions by country to compare if the results maintained the same.

However, it is expected that this study contributes with valuable insights to the available academic literature as well to improve cultural and goal orientation understanding. Insignificant relationships between variables or rejected hypotheses could also work as an object of study for future research. A specific example relays on the relationship between Power Distance and Performance Goal Orientation that was not supported but significant, which means the existence of a significant effect. The influence of cultural dimensions on goal orientation was proved in some way by the effect of some dimensions, remaining a huge range of possibilities to test other relationships and influences.

REFERENCES

- Bertsch, A. (2012). Validating GLOBE's Societal Values Scales: A test in the U.S.A. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3, (8), 10-23.
- Bochner, S., & Beryl, H. (1994). Power Distance, Individualism/Collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. *Journal of Cross-Culture Psychology*, 25, (2), 233-257. Retrieved from <http://jcc.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/25/2/233>.
- Brewer, P., Venaik, S. (2011). Individualism-Collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42, 436-445. doi:10.1057/jibs.2010.62
- Button, S. B., Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1996). Goal orientation in organizational research: A conceptual and empirical foundation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 26-48.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Dweck, C. S. & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256 –273.
- Ghosh, A. (2011). Power distance in organizational contexts – a review of collectivist cultures. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47, (1), 89-101. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/23070557.pdf?refreqid=excelsior:4f97c5f00f7f3d1fda6e9125d96f95a8>
- Hair, J., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19, (2), 139-152
- Hirst, G., Knippenberg, D., & Zhou, J. (2009). A Cross-Level Perspective on Employee Creativity: Goal Orientation, Team Learning Behavior, and Individual Creativity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 2, 280-293. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40390288>
- House, R., Javidan, M., & Dorfman, P. (2001). Project GLOBE: An Introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50, (4), 489-505

Javidan, M., Dastmalchian, A. (2009). Managerial implications of the GLOBE project: A study of 62 societies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 47, (1), 41-58. DOI: 10.1177/1038411108099289.

Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., Sully, d. L., & House, R. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from project GLOBE. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20, (1), 67-90.

Khatri, Naresh. (2009). Consequences of Power Distance Orientation in Organizations. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 13, (1), 1-9. DOI: 10.1177/097226290901300101

Leedy, P. & Ormrod, J. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

McKinney, A. (2003). *Goal Orientation: A test of competing models*. (PhD Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, U.S.A). Retrieved from <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/11074>

Rogers, A., & Spitzmueller, C. (2009). Individualism-collectivism and the role of goal orientation in organizational training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 13, (3), 185-201. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227933018_Individualism-collectivism_and_the_role_of_goal_orientation_in_organizational_training

Senosiain, M. (2012). *Managing in Brazil: A guide for Americans*. (Master Thesis). University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida, U.S.A). Retrieved from http://etd.fcla.edu/CF/CFH0004178/Senosiain_Melanie_B_2012May_BSBA.pdf

Shi, X., & Wang, J. (2011). Interpreting Hofstede model and GLOBE model: Which way to go for cross-cultural research? *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(5), 93-99. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v6n5p93

Tavakol, M., Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55

The GLOBE Foundation (2006). Research Survey GLOBE Project – Form Beta. Retrieved from <http://globeproject.com/data/GLOBE-Phase-2-Beta-Questionnaire-2006.pdf>

The GLOBE Foundation (2006). Syntax for GLOBE National Culture, Organizational Culture, and Leadership Scales. Retrieved from <http://globeproject.com/data/GLOBE-Syntax-Leadership-and-Culture-Scales-2006.pdf>

The GLOBE Foundation. http://globeproject.com/study_2004_2007


VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and validations of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological measurement*, 57, (6), 995-1015. Retrieved from <http://epm.sagepub.com/content/57/6/995>

VandeWalle, D., Cron, W., & Slocum, J. (2001). The Role of Goal orientation following performance feedback. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86, (4), 629-640

VandeWalle, D., & Cummings, L L. (1997). A test of the influence of goal orientation on the feedback-seeking process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 390-400.

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 – Questionnaire



English ▾

Hello!

This survey is an important integrated part of a master thesis in strategy and entrepreneurship.

The goal of this research is to understand the relationship between cultural dimensions and goal orientation among different societies.

The survey will not take longer than 5 minutes and all your answers will be treated confidentially and will be used for internal academic purposes only.

Thank you for your time!

[→](#)

Learning Goal Orientation Questions

Please answer to the following questions regarding your own behavior

The opportunity to do challenging work is important to me.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

When I fail to complete a difficult task, I plan to try harder the next time I work on it.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

I prefer to work on tasks that force me to learn new things.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

The opportunity to learn new things is important to me.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I do my best when I'm working on a fairly difficult task.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I try hard to improve on my past performance.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

The opportunity to extend the range of my abilities is important to me.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

When I have difficulty solving a problem, I enjoy trying different approaches to see which one will work.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree



Performance Goal Orientation Questions

Please answer to the following questions regarding your own behavior

I prefer to do things that I can do well rather than things that I do poorly.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I'm happiest at work when I perform tasks on which I know that I won't make any errors.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

The things I enjoy the most are the things I do the best.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

The opinions others have about how well I do certain things are important to me.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I feel smart when I do something without making any mistakes.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I like to be fairly confident that I can successfully perform a task before I attempt it.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I like to work on tasks that I have done well on in the past.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

I feel smart when I can do something better than most other people.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree



Uncertainty Avoidance Questions

Please answer to the following questions regarding your own society

In your society, orderliness and consistency are stressed, even at the expense of experimentation and innovation.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

In your society, most people lead highly structured lives with few unexpected events.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

In your society, societal requirements and instructions are spelled out in detail so citizens know what they are expected to do.

Strongly agree

Agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Your society has rules or laws to cover:

Almost all situations

Some situations

Very few situations

Institutional Collectivism Questions

Please answer to the following questions regarding your own society

In your society, leaders encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.

Strongly
agree

Agree

Somewhat
agree

Neither
agree
nor
disagree

Somewhat
disagree

Disagree

Strongly
disagree

The economic system in your society is designed to maximize:

Individual
interests

Collective
interests

In your society, being accepted by the other members of a group is very important.

Strongly
agree

Agree

Somewhat
agree

Neither
agree
nor
disagree

Somewhat
disagree

Disagree

Strongly
disagree

In your society:

Group
cohesion is
more value
than
individualism

Group
cohesion
and
individualism
are equally
valued

Individualism
is more
value than
group
cohesion

In-Group Collectivism Questions

Please answer to the following questions regarding your own society

In your society, children take pride in the individual accomplishments of their parents.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

In your society, parents take pride in the individual accomplishments of their children.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

In your society, aging parents generally live at home with their children.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

In your society, children generally live at home with their parents until they get married.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Power Distance Questions

Please answer to the following questions regarding your own society

In your society, a person's influence is based primarily on:

One's
ability and
contribution
to the
society

The
authority
of one's
position

In your society, followers are expected to:

Obey
their
leaders
without
question

Question
their leaders
when in
disagreement

In your society, people in positions of power try to:

Increase
their
social
distance
from less
powerful
individuals

Decrease
their
social
distance
from less
powerful
individuals

In your society, rank and position in the hierarchy have special privileges.

Strongly
agree

Agree

Somewhat
agree

Neither
agree
nor
disagree

Somewhat
disagree

Disagree

Strongly
disagree

In your society, power is:

Concentrated
at the top

Shared
throughout
the society



Performance Orientation Questions

Please answer to the following questions regarding your own society

In your society, teen-aged students are encouraged to strive for continuously improved performance.

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	----------------------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

In your society, major rewards are based on:

Only performance effectiveness			Performance effectiveness and other factors (for example, seniority or political connections)			Only factors other than performance effectiveness (for example, seniority or political connections)
--------------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	---

In your society, being innovative to improve performance is generally:

Substantially rewarded			Somewhat rewarded			Not rewarded
------------------------	--	--	-------------------	--	--	--------------

← →

Demographic Questions

Gender

 Male Female

Age

 < 20 20-30 31-40 41-50 51-60 >60

Nationality

Annual Income

Less than €5,000

€5,000 - €10,999

€11,000 - €20,999

€21,000 - €30,999

€31,000 - €40,999

€41,000 - €50,999

€51,000 - €60,999

€61,000 - €70,999

€71,000 - €80,999

€81,000 - €90,999

€91,000 - €99,999

More than €100,000

Highest degree of school

Less than high school

High school graduate

Bachelor Degree

Master Degree

Doctorate

