2010

Women's Social Status and Economic Security: Dependent upon Interdependent Strategies

Christine M. Willingham

Women's Social Status and Economic Security: Dependent upon Interdependent Strategies

A thesis submitted to
Barry University
in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of
Masters of Arts in Public Relations and Corporate Communication

by

Christine M. Willingham
July 2010

Barry University
Department of Communication

Master's Thesis Written by

Christine Willingham
B.A., Salisbury University, 1981
M.A., Barry University, 2010

Approved by:

_____, Chair, Master's Thesis Committee
Dr. Margaret K. Chojnacki

_____, Member, Master's Thesis Committee
Dr. Katherine L. Nelson

Willingham, Christine (M.A., Communication)

Women's Social Status and Economic Security: Dependent upon Interdependent Strategies July/2010

Abstract of a Master's thesis at Barry University.
Thesis supervised by Dr. Margaret K. Chojnacki

Number of pages in text 65

Abstract

Individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, power distance and uncertainty avoidance, are dimensions of national culture identified by Hofstede (1984) based on survey results collected between 1968-1972 of 117,000 IBM employees from 57 countries. As women were largely absent from the workplace during this period, it is not surprising that women comprised only between 4% and 16% of a country's sampling (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). Historically, women's social status and economic security have been dependent on marriage, and women have occupied fewer positions of power. Yamagishi (1988) and Kollock (1994) suggested that collectivistic and individualistic behaviors are strategies, dependent upon situational circumstances, used to maximize personal outcomes. The current study administered Hofstede's Values Survey Module 2008 questionnaire to 75 women and men residing in the United States and demonstrated distinct differences between women and men on these dimensions of national culture. Specifically, women were more collectivistic and scored higher than men on the dimensions of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity.

Acknowledgements

When I was eight years old, I dreamed I would be a writer; of course, my fantasy was to write a novel full of magic and adventure. I had no realization of the time, effort, and dedication the writing of a major work involved. The journey was long, and there were many who supported my efforts.

I deeply appreciate the support of my daughters, Samantha and Katie Fazenbaker; they never complained about preparing dinner or washing dishes while I spent nights and weekends working on this thesis. I love you! To my friends, Melanie and Bob, you believed in me, even on the days I didn't believe in myself. Your belief kept me going.

My classmate, Veronique LeRoy, suggested I should consider writing a thesis rather than completing a capstone project. She thought I should leave my options open to pursue a doctoral degree. Thank you, Veronique, for the faith in me.

Dr. Margaret Chojnacki was my graduate advisor. She opened the world of academia to me. Her support, guidance, and encouragement were invaluable to the completion of this work. Dr. Katherine Nelson, my professor and thesis committee member, is an exceptional editor. Her insightful comments vastly improved this document.

Thank you to Jeff Fazenbaker, my ex-husband. You taught me to take risks and, when life gets tough, you rise to meet the challenges and overcome the obstacles.

My deepest appreciation goes to Gene and Gloria Willingham, my parents, who encouraged me to pursue higher education. I love you both!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS		v
LIST OF APPENDICES		vii
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
	Social Systems Theory	6
	The State of U.S. Women	8
	Cultural Dimensions	13
	Interaction Patterns are Situational	15
	The Current Study	18
III.	METHOD	25
	Participants	25
	Procedure	25
	Selection	26
	Data Collection	27
	Analysis Procedures	27
IV.	RESULTS	28
	Individualism	29
	Power Distance	29
	Masculinity	29

Uncertainty Avoidance 30

V. DISCUSSION 31

Problems and Limitations 31

Future Implications 33

APPENDICES 41

REFERENCES 50

LIST OF APPENDICES

		Page
Appendix A	Values Survey Module 2008 Questionnaire	41
Appendix B	Additional demographic questions	46
Appendix C	Letter to Facebook users	47
Appendix D	Letter requesting access to members	48
Appendix E	Letter to association members	49

Women's Social Status and Economic Security:
Dependent upon Interdependent Strategies

Chapter I

In 1492, Christopher Columbus sailed from Spain and, in a little over a month's time, reached the islands known today as the Bahamas (The Applied History Research Group, 1997). More than 500 years later, the trip can be made, aboard a commercial airplane, in less than nine hours. News of Columbus' landfall traveled back to Spain via Columbus' return transatlantic voyage in 1493 whereas, in the 21st century, news of a major world event is broadcast within minutes around the globe. The advances in transportation and information technology have resulted in regional economies, societies, and cultures becoming increasingly integrated. "Whenever two cultures…are set in proximity to one another, an interplay takes place, a sort of magical change. The more unlike the interface, the greater the tension of the interchange" (McLuhan & Powers, 1989, p. 4). The increasing interchange among disparate cultures has created a need for effective communication methods that transcend cultural differences. The adaptive nature of humans suggests individuals will enact behaviors necessary for successful interaction, provided they have the knowledge to do so. Global organizations, such as IBM, have a vested interest in understanding how cultural differences affect their operations and profitability.

The management of IBM opened their workplace to Geert Hofstede, PhD, a social psychologist and founder of IBM Europe's Personnel Research Department. Between 1968-1972, Hofstede surveyed 117,000 IBM employees from 57 countries. "Four…main dimensions on which country cultures differ were revealed through theoretical reasoning

and statistical analysis; they reflect basic problems that any society has to cope with but for which solutions differ" (Hofstede, 2001, p. xix). The four dimensions of culture (individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance) succinctly categorize national cultures and provide a road map to interaction across the globe.

In his book, Culture's Consequences, Hofstede (1980) set the agenda for intercultural research. An abridged version was published in 1984 (a search on Google Scholar, February 20, 2010, resulted in 12,801 citations) and a revised edition in 2001. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind (1991) was published for the lay reader and printed in 17 languages (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). The second edition was released in 2004 and the third edition followed in May 2010.

To ensure that cultural differences explained his results, Hofstede utilized matched sampling by occupation (assuming those in a similar occupation would belong to a similar social class). By controlling for other possible social variables, the variance between cultures could be stated, with greater confidence, to be a result of cultural differences. Three of the 38 occupations represented in the sample contained sufficient representation of men and women for a gender analysis. The possibility of a gender effect was considered and controlled for and the masculinity/femininity dimension was the only one "on which the men and the women among the IBM employees scored consistently differently (except…in countries at the extreme feminine pole)" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 119).

Hofstede did not seem to question the validity of his gender analysis nor did he consider that a lack of women in the sample might bias his conclusions. “The percentage of women in the IBM survey population varied from 4.0 in Pakistan to 16.2 in Finland” (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 384). The paucity of women in the sample reflects the overall absence of women in the workplace at that time. In 1969, women were 35.3% of all workers on U.S. payrolls (Shriver & Center for American Progress, 2009). Although Hofstede made sweeping statements and categorizations about the nature of cultures and the differences among them, the validity of those conclusions is suspect due to the under-representation of approximately half of the world population. As Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1985) stated:

> Women had almost no involvement in creating these theories as researchers. But more startling and serious is the fact that women are seldom included even as research subjects in the studies that have generated our theories of human development. (p. 10)

Hofstede and Hofstede (2004) emphatically maintained that cultural dimensions do not describe an individual or individuals within a culture. The dimensions of culture are elements of a social system defined by the political borders of nations. “Gender, generation, and class cultures can only partly be classified by the dimensions found for national cultures. This is because they are categories of people within social systems, not integrated social systems such as countries or ethnic groups” (Hofstede & Hofstede, p. 34). Hofstede and Hofstede asserted that select individuals control the institutions of a country “such as governments and education systems” (p.48). As the controlling class,

defining characteristics among them would be an accurate representation of national social systems. Geert Hofstede acknowledged that his research expressed "differences among middle-class persons" (Hofstede & Hofstede, p. 48), but asserted that the middle-class typically controls the institutions of a country. If the largely male and middle-class employees of IBM are representative of the controlling class, the question then becomes, what role, if any, do women have within the system? Are women a category of people within, but outside, the social system? If women were not members of the controlling class, the inclusion of women in the sample would not alter the results. However, if women were integral members of the system, then Hofstede's (1984) conclusions must be qualified as a partial representation. Using the theoretical perspective of social systems theory, the author compared women in the United States, on Hofstede's dimensions of culture, to U.S. men, and demonstrated that women's place within the social structure shapes the strategies women use to gain social status and economic security.

Chapter II

Literature Review

The Values Survey Module 2008 Manual (VSM 08) (Hofstede, Hofstede, Minkov, & Vinken, 2008) provides instructions for researchers who wish to utilize the VSM 08 questionnaire developed by Hofstede in their research. Researchers are emphatically reminded the instrument is a cultural comparison tool and using it to make conclusions about individuals is nothing more than stereotyping. The following analogy is offered:

> The study of national culture dimensions belongs to anthropology; the study of individual personality belongs to psychology. The first is to the second as studying forests is to studying trees. Forests cannot be described with the same dimensions as trees, nor can they be understood as bunches of trees. What should be added to the analysis at the forest level is the interaction between different trees and other plants, animals, organisms and climate factors, together described by the term biotope. In reverse, trees cannot be described with the same dimensions as forests. At best one can ask in what kind of forest this tree would be most likely found, and how well it would do there.
>
> (pp. 3-4)

Humans are individuals acting with autonomy for their individual survival. However, as social animals our individual survival is dependent upon competent interaction with other humans. Through interaction, we create rules and symbolic meanings that guide future interactions. These symbolic meanings facilitate interaction

with others and constrain individual action. Collectively, the social rules and symbolic meanings create a culture with discernible characteristics. Luhmann (1995) explained the relationship of the individual to society by using social systems theory.

Social Systems Theory. Social systems theory asserts that society "is the ecosystem of interactions" (Luhmann, 1995, p. 433); consequently, "one cannot dismantle the societal system into interaction systems or join together interaction systems to make the societal system" (p. 418). The societal system arises from communication and symbolic meanings produced by communication interaction; however, the society consists of dimensions separate from the individual interactions that comprise society. A social system is analogous to the biotope of the forest. Humans act individually, but collective actions become a social system with unique characteristics distinct from individual action. Individual communication interactions contribute to the social system and the social system sets the parameters for communication events; the system and individual interaction are distinct but interdependent.

The social system "produces an arrangement of freedoms and commitments for interaction," the interaction partners in a communication episode understand these commitments, and "everyone agrees that this is how things are" (Luhmann, 1995, p. 419). Prior knowledge enables future communication to be subsequently more effective. According to Richardson (1988), "we simultaneously inhabit a micro world of face-to-face relationships and a macro world of abstract and remote institutional arrangements. The micro world makes full sense only in the context of the macro one that enfolds it" (p. 209).

Communication episodes serve to reproduce the social system in an automatic fashion. From the moment we are born, we are socialized to the "symbols, heroes, rituals, and values" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 6) of our social system. Parents teach their children what they themselves were taught, educational systems reproduce the symbolic meanings of the system through teachings of language, history, and rational thought processes, and exposure to mass media reinforces system values.

Simple systems (e.g., husband/wife or parent/child) composed of only two persons are unstable because "they cannot be broken down further without destroying the participants' social quality of life" (Luhmann, 1995, p. 407). In contrast, complex systems, such as national cultures "acquire permanence" because they outlast the "death of individuals" (p. 407). A complex system adapts to changing circumstances such as political, economic, and social upheaval. The IBM organizational system resides within larger, more complex systems. Hofstede's (1984, 2001; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004) conclusion that the organizational system of IBM is descriptive of the national cultures in which the respondents reside is comparable to describing a forest by the characteristics of an ecological system within the forest. For example, IBM was ranked 48th among the world's 500 largest corporations by Fortune magazine (2010) and, consequently, a significant contributor to the global economy. However, if IBM ceased to exist, the global economy would adjust and outlast IBM's demise. A correct analysis of national cultures must include the additional systems within a culture such as familial, educational, and political systems.

The social system into which an individual is born becomes their primary system and, through the socialization process, they will adhere to the expectations for interaction when communicating with other members of the system. To interact effectively in a different system, individuals need knowledge of the "commitments and role obligations" (Luhmann, 1995, p. 419) of the new system. Hofstede's research is intriguing because it attempts to provide an outline of the expectations for interaction in each national culture. As transportation and information technology have increased interaction between once relatively isolated systems, individuals require knowledge of other systems for survival.

The State of U.S. Women. In 1963, just five years prior to Hofstede's first data collection, Betty Friedan's The Feminine Mystique was first released (re-released in 2001). The Feminine Mystique is credited with launching the Second Wave of the feminist movement. The book paints a portrait of the nature of U.S. gender role segregation from, finally, a woman's perspective:

> The feminine mystique says that the highest value and the only commitment for women is the fulfillment of their own femininity…It says this femininity is so mysterious and intuitive and close to the creation and origin of life that man-made science may never be able to understand it. But however special and different, it is in no way inferior to the nature of man; it may even in certain respects be superior…the root of women's troubles in the past is that women envied men, women tried to be like men, instead of accepting their own nature, which can find fulfillment only in sexual passivity, male domination, and nurturing maternal love. (Friedan, 2001, p. 43)

Women, at the time of Hofstede's original sampling, were largely absent from the workplace. In 1967, only 11.7% of family breadwinners were mothers, and 16% were co-breadwinners (Shriver & Center for American Progress, 2009); in 1969 women were 35.3% of all workers on U.S. payrolls. The Feminine Mystique described the expected role of women within the social system to be in the home nurturing the family. Men, on the other hand, were expected to be providers of resources. The assigned gender roles maintained the needs of a social system based on the nuclear family. Bell (1997) illustrated the power of role expectations within a system:

> An individual, standing alone, can never have a right to a thing. Even when an individual is strong enough and/or fierce enough to gain possession of a desired benefit, individual effort alone does not define a right. Rights are conferred by the actions of others. (p. 238)

Strict gender role differentiation limited women's ability to acquire resources; making women's, and their children's, economic security dependent on the institution of marriage. "More than an emotional relationship, marriage [functioned as] an economic partnership and social safety net" (Wilcox, 2009b, p. 16). Duty, obligation, and sacrifice were the foundations of marriage (Wilcox, 2009a) as "the traditional nuclear family is a somewhat inequalitarian group…that requires the suppression of some individuality" (National Marriage Project, 2007, p. 9). That suppression of individuality fell largely onto the wife, as she agreed to the male dominance the social system required of her. Labor within the family was divided according to gender with "men transfer(ring) resources to women in exchange for sex and for access to children" (Edlund & Pande, 2002, pp. 922-

923), and women laboring as caretakers.

Still, marriage did not ensure economic security for women. According to Statutes Governing Property Today (1947), 35 states were common law states. A woman under common law might be entitled to support, but did not own a share of her husband's income. She could own property but her husband retained control. In the event of her husband's death, under common law statute, a woman was entitled to a dower, typically equaling about one-third of her husband's estate. Two states, Arizona and Washington, held that "a wife living in adultery had no claims to any of the income of her husband" (p.296). The prevailing marriage laws in 1963 held that "if a couple divorced and the wife had been a homemaker, she was not entitled to share the earnings her husband had accumulated during their marriage" (Shriver & Center for American Progress, 2009, p. 373).

Since 1963, economic opportunities have continually increased for women and in July 2009 women became 49.9% of the paid labor force, the largest representation of women to date (Shriver & Center for American Progress, 2009). However, women are still more financially dependent on marriage than men. A wage gap continues to exist between men and women, with women earning 77.1% of men's earnings in 2008 (Hartmann, Hegewisch, Liepmann, & Williams, 2009). This often quoted statistic is based on annual earnings of full-time workers and the self-employed and excludes the 17 million women (14% of women living in the U.S.) working less than 35 hours a week.

Women hold the majority of lower-paying positions. As a result, 90% of those earning less than $15,000 annually are women (English & Hegewisch, 2008). Within

occupations dominated by women, men still earn more; in only 5 out of 500 occupations (with enough statistical data available to analyze) do women equal or exceed their male counterparts in earnings (Young, 2009). Women exceed men's earnings in: "Other life, physical, and social science technicians (women earn 102.4% of men's earnings), bakers (104%), teacher assistants (104.6%), and dining room and cafeteria attendants and bartender helpers (111.1%)" (Hegewisch, 2010, p. 9). In some occupations, one has to wonder how cultural values impact the determination of a fair hourly wage. For example, "non-supervisory child care workers," dominated by women, and "laborers and freight, stock, and material movers," dominated by men, are both relatively low-paid positions. Childcare workers generally need a high school diploma and may need special certifications in CPR, first aid, and fire safety. Laborers generally only require physical strength; however, laborers' average hourly earnings are $10.89 whereas childcare workers earn $9.12; a difference of 16% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010b). Does not the U.S. social system urge "mothers to give unselfishly of their time, money and love on behalf of sacred children" (Hays, 1996, p. 97)? Childcare workers, in caring for small children, hold more responsibility and are exposed to greater liability. Yet men moving goods earn more than those caring for our sacred children.

Women's annual earnings cluster below $50,000 annually, with only 9.6% of women earning above $50,000, whereas 44.5% of men annually earn more than $50,000 (English & Hegewisch, 2008). The wage gap, when calculated over time, becomes far more than a difference of cents: over a 15-year period, the average woman earns $273,592; the average man earns $722,693 (English & Hegewisch). This is a difference

of 62%. According to English and Hegewisch, a wage gap at the outset increases over time, because raises are frequently a percentage of salary.

Today, in almost 80% of families with children, the mother works outside the home. However, mothers remain less likely to work than non-mothers. “Having one child lowers a woman's lifetime earnings by 13%; two children lower her earnings by 19%” (Szegedy-Masak, 2001, p. 48). Only 34% of single mother families receive some child support and/or alimony (Caiazza, 2002-2003) and, for low-income single mothers, the support is a small portion of total household income ranging from 1.2% of annual income to 5.3% (Hartmann, Spalter-Roth & Sills, 2003). For women after divorce, remarriage is often the route to regaining economic security (Edlund & Pande, 2002). In a 15-year study, 48.5% of women and 84% of men had earnings in each of the 15 years, and 3 out of 10 women, compared to 1 of 20 men, reported four or more years without earnings (English & Hegewisch, 2008). “The average woman spends 12 years out of the paid workforce, often to care for children or elderly relatives” (Kornbluh & Homer, 2009, p. 30). Women pay a penalty for time removed from the workforce, an estimated 10% of income for every two years out of the paid labor market, and the loss is never recouped (Belkin, 2009).

Hence, mothers face additional bias in the workforce. The gender wage gap of 77 cents earned by women conceals the discrepancy between non-mothers and mothers. Women without children are closer to men’s earnings at 90 cents while married mothers earn 73 cents and single mothers earn 60 cents to a man’s dollar (Shriver & Center for American Progress, 2009). Single mother-led families have a poverty rate of 28.3%. In

August of 2009, 12.2% of single mothers were unemployed, compared to 6.4% for married men and 6.1% for married women (English, Hartmann & Hegewisch, 2009), and this remained constant throughout the 2009 calendar year (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010a).

Crittenden (2001) made a salient observation: "…if human abilities are the ultimate fount of economic progress, as many economists now agree, and if those abilities are nurtured (or stunted) in the early years, then mothers and other caregivers of the young are the most important producers in the economy" (p. 11). The global economy and the family have been free riders (i.e., someone who gets something for nothing), "dependent on female caregivers who offer their labor in return for little or no compensation" (Crittenden, p. 9). The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2007) estimated that more than two-thirds of the world's unpaid work is done by women; yet women receive only 10% of the world's income and own 1% of the world's property. Women's unpaid work is estimated to be the equivalent of $11 trillion, or almost half of the world gross domestic product (United Nations Development Programme, 1995). Hence, a complete examination of a social system must include the significant contributions of women. Hofstede ignored the role of women in the social system by limiting his focus to individuals in the workplace.

Cultural Dimensions. "We engage in social interactions with others to improve our own welfare, material or psychological" (Yamagishi, Cook, & Watabe, 1998, p. 170). According to Fiske (2002), human behavior is dependent upon situational demands and can vary greatly. A social system's symbolic culture "develops, in part, as a means of

adaptation to the social and natural environment" (Kashima et al, 1995, p. 926). As individuals travel between cultures, they will enact the necessary behaviors to ensure successful interactions, provided they understand the requirements of the symbolic culture in which they are interacting. If Hofstede's cultural dimensions are indeed a description of the forest, individual trees will adapt to the structural demands of the forest into which they are transplanted. A highly adaptive individual is an asset to global organizations (such as IBM), while also providing greater individual earning opportunities.

Hofstede (1984, 2001) succinctly categorized national cultures on four dimensions thereby providing a road map for interaction across the globe: individualism/collectivism, power distance, masculinity/femininity, and uncertainty avoidance (a fifth dimension, long term orientation, was added in 1988; see Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). The individualism dimension, with collectivism being "its opposite" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 76), is the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups. A highly individualistic culture encourages "an independent self; collectivist cultures, an interdependent self" (p. 93). The Power Distance Index "is the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally" (Hofstede, 2010a, home page). Masculinity/femininity is the degree of differentiation between the assigned "emotional gender roles" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 120) of men and women. In highly feminine cultures, the emotional roles tend to overlap; "both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with quality of life" (p. 120). In highly

masculine cultures, emotional roles are distinct; “men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success, whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with quality of life” (p. 120). Finally, the extent to which a culture “programs its members to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unstructured situations” (Hofstede, 2010a, home page) is named the Uncertainty Avoidance Index.

The social system requires “external commitments” that “lead to the self-control of individual participants, for each is expected to maintain role consistency” (Luhmann, 1995, p. 419) as role consistency supports the needs of the system. Characteristics such as assertiveness and modesty are “culturally contingent” (Fiske, 2002, p. 78) and, consequently, malleable to the demands of the system. “Given their other commitments and role obligations, the participants are in a certain way different persons elsewhere because their personal identity is connected there with other histories and other expectations” (Luhmann, p. 419).

Interaction Patterns are Situational. Luhmann (1998) suggested “the division between acting and observing” creates a “conflict of attribution” in which “the actor judges his acting to have been called for by a particular situation, whereas the observer in contrast tends to attribute the acting to the characteristics of the actor’s personality” (p. 35). According to Hofstede and Hofstede (2004), cultural dimensions reflect the values held by cultural group members. An individual is programmed with the values of “the social environment in which one grew up and collected one’s life experiences” and this becomes “the software of the mind” (p. 3) upon which interaction is based. Cultural values are relatively stable, “in spite of sweeping changes in practices” (p. 13). However,

as the participants in Hofstede's sample were surveyed in a singular and particular context, we cannot assume cultural values will remain stable across contexts.

The mental software of the mind implies that an individual's response to social situations will be informed by their programming, that individuals from the same culture hold similar programming, and responses to social situations will be predictable. Kollock (1994) demonstrated that interaction patterns are contingent on situational circumstances. For the study, college students residing in California, a culture rated low on the Uncertainty Avoidance Index, were randomly assigned as buyers or sellers in simulated trading interactions. Buyers and sellers could choose their trading partners, but could not see each other, and were randomly assigned to certain or uncertain trading interactions. In the uncertainty trading condition, buyers and sellers developed committed trading relationships, often choosing a trusted trading partner over purchasing at a lower price from an unfamiliar trading partner. In the certainty condition, buyers sought the best price and created trading relationships with less frequency. The research participants all resided within the same culture, with opportunities for similar programming, yet engaged in different interaction patterns based upon situational conditions. If the quality of goods was known, it was advantageous to behave individually (obtain the best price) but in the uncertainty condition, committed in-group relationships provided better outcomes. In a separate and later experiment, Yamagishi, Cook, and Watabe (1998) confirmed that social uncertainty was positively related to commitment formation for both Japanese and U.S. participants.

The outcome of trusted relationships, or group cooperation, is dependent upon the level of cooperation among group members, or cooperation between in-group and out-group members. For members of collectivistic cultures, the in-group "is the major source of one's identity," and provides "secure protection against the hardships of life" in exchange for "lifelong loyalty to one's in-group" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 75). According to Hofstede and Hofstede, when "a member has infringed upon the rules of society" the member "will feel ashamed, based on a sense of collective obligation" (p. 89). Reciprocal cooperation (i.e., that group members will engage in equal levels of cooperation) is expected from other group members (Axelrod & Hamilton, 1981). If reciprocal cooperation is not achieved, group members will enact punishment behaviors (sanctioning) directed toward noncompliant group members (Shinada, Yamagishi & Ohmura, 2004).

Yamagishi (1988) demonstrated the importance of sanctioning in maintaining group cooperation. Because Japan is more collectivistic on the individualism dimension than the United States (Hofstede, 1984, 2001), we can expect Japanese citizens, compared to U.S. citizens, to enact higher levels of group cooperation. Japanese and U.S. participants engaged in prisoner's dilemma scenarios with either a sanctioning system present or absent (Yamagishi, 1988). In the absence of a sanctioning system, the Japanese participants were less cooperative than the U.S. participants and Japanese participants exited a group containing free riders more often than U.S. participants. In a separate study (Chojnacki, 2001), collectivistic participants, self-identified as being from

a country ranked as collectivistic by Hofstede (1984), cooperated more with an individualistic opponent than with other collectivistic opponents.

Hence, an accurate comparison of cultures must include a comparison of the social and natural environments surrounding social interactions. Hofstede attempted to account for additional variables and analyzed the data for geographic latitude, population size, and wealth (Gross National Product). A higher latitude "contributes to smaller power distances [sic]" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 69, author emphasis). Interestingly, while the authors consider social and environmental variables important to the explanation of differences among national cultures, "gender, generation, and class….are categories of people within social systems" (p. 35) rather than contributors to the construction and maintenance of the system. In Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, Hofstede and Hofstede (2004) suggested we accept that gender differences exist within each culture, thereby creating a men's culture that differs from women's culture (p. 34). However, behavioral gender differences are not inherent to the nature of men and women; they represent the role expectations of the social system. If geographic latitude contributes to differences among national cultures, we cannot assume women, whose unpaid work is estimated to be almost half of the world gross domestic product (United Nations Development Programme, 1995), to be an irrelevant social variable.

Current Study. "Human pecking orders are part of the 'universal' level of human mental programming" (Hofstede, 1984, p. 66). To define equality, Hofstede (1984) quoted Plato:

> But the most genuine equality, and the best, is not so obvious…The general method I mean is to grant much to the great and less to the less great, adjusting what you give to take account of the real nature of each. (p. 66)

Hofstede stated, "In male-dominated societies, most women want the male dominance" (p. 128). According to Form and Rytina (1969), Hofstede can make this claim because he is a man:

> Since an ideology explains and vindicates the unequal distribution of rewards in a society, it follows that those who are the most favored recipients of the rewards support the ideology most fervently and make strongest claims for the convergence of its normative and existential tenets. (p. 20)

Moulettes (2007) used a postcolonial perspective to criticize the assumptions Hofstede made regarding women and femininity, while largely excluding the voice of women from his research. Men define femininity in such a way as to maintain their definitions of masculinity. "Women's values differ less among countries than men's values do, and a country's femininity is more clearly reflected in the values of its men than in those of its women" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 125). Hofstede's (1984 & 2001) cultural model reduces women to "shadow figures in the margin of the global economy" (Moulettes, p. 451).

The U.S. scored highest on the individualism dimension and scored higher than the remaining national cultures represented in the study (Hofstede, 1984, 2001; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). The second highest dimension for the U.S. was masculinity, followed by uncertainty avoidance, and the lowest was power distance.

The social, institutional, and cultural environment of the United States promotes development of independence and autonomy in men but interdependence and relatedness in women (Cross & Madson, 1997). In an article that appeared in ForbesWoman (2009), the male author (Salzburg) satirized his communication interactions with female dating partners:

> Like most men, I'm more concrete and I think women are more abstract. Men don't usually examine the implications or the connotations of what they say. They just say it. Women, on the other hand, tend to try to read between the lines. They try to get to the deeper meaning of what's being said and the problem is, most men, myself included, just aren't that deep. (¶ 9 & 10)

The social position of men does not require them to be "deep." Reading nonverbal cues and anticipating how to make their partner happy is the purview of women.

Focusing on verbal communication is essentially low-context communication, and is characteristic of an individualistic culture (e.g., I mean what I say and say what I mean). In contrast, those in collectivistic cultures attend to nonverbal communication and what is not said (e.g., reading between the lines) (Hall, 1976). This high-context communication, i.e., "inhibiting the 'I' perspective and processing the 'thou' perspective" (Hsu, 1981, as cited in Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 229) is considered most important in maintaining interpersonal connection. Women's dependence on marriage, combined with their responsibility to maintain the bonds of the family unit, requires them to anticipate the needs of their partners. So for women in the U.S., commitment formation is an adaptive behavior to the social and natural environments in

which women find themselves; their interdependent skills are highly effective behaviors for ensuring the continuation of a trust-based relationship. According to Markus and Kitayama:

> Experiencing interdependence entails seeing oneself as part of an encompassing social relationship and recognizing that one's behavior is determined, contingent on, and, to a large extent, organized by what the actor perceives to be the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others in the relationship. (p. 227)

Individuals hold perceptions of their private inner selves that can be distinct from their public selves. These perceptions, called self-construal, are influenced by societal role expectations and, in turn, influence individual interaction (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Markus and Kitayama distinguishes between the interdependent self-construal of women as the tendency to describe themselves in terms of relatedness to others, and the independent self-construal of men as the propensity to focus on what makes them unique and independent of others. For example, Belenky et al., (1985) described the "responsibility orientation" of women in which "conflicts are resolved not by invoking a logical hierarchy of abstract principles, but through trying to understand the conflict in the context of each person's perspective, needs, and goals – and doing the best for everyone involved" (p. 26). As such, the knowledge women cultivate in the context of interpersonal relationships is defined as "connected knowing," and is generated from "intimacy and equality between self and object" (Belenky et al., p. 22), rather than from an impartial, positivistic paradigm. With an interdependent self-construal, the goal is to understand rather than prove.

Furthermore, women remember relationship events such as a first date or an anniversary more often than men, and women's reports of their partner's feelings are more accurate than men's reports (Cross & Madson, 1997). The need to understand social interaction in the context of each person's perspective, needs, and goals typifies individuals with an interdependent self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Interdependent individuals tend to see themselves "as part of an encompassing social relationship," and base their actions upon "the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others in the relationship" (p. 227). These individuals shoulder the responsibility of mind reading to determine what is best for the significant other, and assume their partners are doing the same for them. This holds true even in the face of contradictory evidence. For example, a 50-year old woman described how she bit her stepfather when he tried to rape her at the age of 13, but continued to worry about her response to his aggression: "I've never been that type of person that wants to hurt other people. I'd rather take the hurt myself..." (Belenky et al., 1985, p. 17). The respondent considered her own pain secondary to the pain of a significant other, a consideration the other clearly did not take.

Men tend to avoid expressing emotions of dependence (e.g., fear or sadness), but express anger more readily than women. In contrast, women avoid expressions of anger but are more likely to express fear or sadness (Cross & Madson, 1997). This may be because anger, frustration, and pride are expressions of an individual's internal needs whereas sympathy and feelings of interpersonal communion are other-focused (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). According to Markus and Kitayama, "…expressing and experiencing ego-focused emotions…is one viable way to assert and affirm the status of the self as an

independent entity" (p. 237). Markus and Kitayama found that Americans and Western Europeans experience anger primarily in close, interpersonal relationships. Comparatively, Japanese respondents avoid anger in close relationships but expressed the emotion more readily with strangers.

In addition, women tend to worry about how their achievements affect their interpersonal relationships; they are less likely to promote their own success if they believe their achievement will make others feel bad about themselves. "Those with interdependent selves will typically not claim that they are better than others, will not express pleasure in the state of feeling superior to others" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 245). Men, on the other hand, use achievement to portray themselves as unique and are more likely to discuss their achievements with others (Cross & Madson, 1997). As such, research indicates husbands are less happy in their marriages when their wives become breadwinners (National Marriage Project, 2007). In fact in one study, when a woman's pay outpaced her husband's, the men worked additional hours to regain their breadwinner position (Cha & Thébaud, 2009).

Access to power and resources are important variables to consider when investigating gender differences. For example, Kollock, Blumstein, and Schwartz (1985) reported that the conversational behavior of couples is dictated by the power dynamics in the relationship. Kollock et al observed the conversations in three types of established couples (i.e., heterosexual, lesbian, and gay). In each case, regardless of gender, the more powerful partner dominated the conversation and freely violated conversational norms, whereas the less powerful partner engaged in facilitating behaviors and adhered to

conversational norms. The tendency of women to have an interdependent self-construal, a characteristic of collectivistic cultures, is the adaptive response to the existing social structure of gender role differentiation. Because women are dependent upon the resources men generate and control, women's interdependent behaviors are effective strategies to maintain commitment formation. "Understanding that power differences can create the appearance of sex differences does not reduce the realities of sexual inequality" (Kollock et al., p. 45).

Given the characteristics of an interdependent self-construal, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H1: Women will score lower on the individualism dimension than men.
H2: Women will score higher on the power distance dimension than men.
H3: Women will score lower on the masculinity dimension than men.
H4: Women will score higher on the uncertainty avoidance dimension than men.

Chapter III

Method

Participants. Seventy-five (36 male, 37 female, 2 gender unknown) adults living in Broward County, Florida volunteered to participate in an online survey titled Revisiting Cultural Dimensions. Participants ranged in age between 25 and 59 with the majority of participants (62.5%) between the ages of 40 and 59. Most of the participants were educated (62.5% having completed 16 years or more of formal education), lived with a romantic partner (56.9%) and were childless (54.8%). The participants self-identified as American (86.3%); 9.5% reported being born in a country other than the United States.

Procedure. The survey was created in SurveyMonkey utilizing Hofstede's Values Survey Module 2008 (VSM08; see Appendix A) and additional demographic questions (see Appendix B), created by the author. The demographic questions followed the VSM08 questions.

The VSM08 "may be freely used for research purposes" (Hofstede, 2008, p. 1). The survey was downloaded from http://www.geert-hofstede.com. Participants were anonymous; no identifying information was collected. A message (Appendix C) requesting their participation was sent to them electronically; successful completion of the survey represented informed consent. No debriefing occurred but the participants were thanked for their participation. Participants needed internet access to complete the survey.

Selection. SurveyMonkey provides the ability to create multiple URL addresses for a survey, called "Collectors," to track the recruitment method that generated the response. As two distinct participant recruitment methods were used, two collectors were created. The researcher did not collect the IP addresses of the respondents; this feature of SurveyMonkey was turned off.

The City of Fort Lauderdale recognizes 70 registered civic associations. An email was sent to the contact person for each group (Appendix D) requesting their help. The contact person was asked to forward an email from the researcher (Appendix E), requesting the member's participation, to their list of members. The email provided the SurveyMonkey link. This method yielded nine participants.

Facebook, a social media website that allows users to affiliate and communicate with networks of friends and organizations, was also used to recruit participants. Facebook provides users the opportunity to display as little or as much information as they choose and to control access to their information. Any Facebook user may send another Facebook user a message. The researcher used her personal Facebook identity to recruit participants.

As of July 2009, over 53% of Facebook users were between the ages of 25 and 55 and the 35-55 age group had a growth rate of 190% (Schroeder, 2009). The researcher searched for users whose page listed their "current city" as "Fort Lauderdale;" because she is also listed as a user in "Fort Lauderdale" she was able to access a list of users within the same network. In April, 2010, she sent a message (Appendix C) to 750 users as they appeared in the list (unless their listed age was younger than 25 or older than 59).

Facebook constrains the frequency of messages to obstruct spammers (i.e., someone who sends unwanted messages to a large group of users) that, consequently, constrained the researcher's ability to reach additional users within the designated time frame for data collection. Facebook contact yielded 66 participants.

Data Collection. SurveyMonkey collected participants' responses. At the conclusion of the data collection period, responses were entered into a data analysis program (SPSS).

Analysis Procedures. Descriptive analysis revealed the demographics of the participants. Means for each survey question were calculated by gender. The means were entered into the cultural dimensions' index formulas as directed by the VSM08 manual (Hofstede et al., 2008) for the dimensions of individualism, power distance, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. The index formulas are as follows:

Individualism/Collectivism (IDV) = 35(m04 – m01) + 35(m09 – m06) + C(ic)

Power Distance (PDI) = 35(m07 – m02) + 25(m23 – m26) + C(pd)

Masculinity/Femininity (MAS) = 35(m05 – m03) + 35(m08 – m10) + C(mf)

Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) = 40(m20 - m16) + 25(m24 – m27) + C(ua)

Chapter IV

Results

Using the index formulas outlined in the VMS08 manual (Hofstede et al., 2008) differences were found between women and men on the cultural dimensions of individualism, power distance, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance.

	Individualism	Power Distance	Masculinity	Uncertainty Avoidance
Women	26.25	39.05	8.05	46.15
Men	28.7	33.75	7.70	21.65

The index formulas, as published in the VSM 08 manual include adding "a constant (positive or negative) that depends on the nature of the samples; it does not affect the comparison between countries. It can be chosen by the user to shift her/his…scores to values between 0 and 100" (Hofstede et al., 2008, p. 7). The constant numbers used by Hofstede to calculate the four dimensions are published in Culture's Consequences (2001, p. 494); however, the index formulas in that edition are different from the VSM08 index formulas.

To make a meaningful comparison of the sample index scores to the U.S. index scores (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004), the applied constant number would need to be consistent in both scenarios. In email correspondence with the author, Dr. Geert Hofstede said "formulas only provide a **comparison between** two or more matched samples, never an absolute score that can be compared to the scores in our book(s)." As a result, it is not

possible to compare the sample results to Hofstede's U.S. index scores. However, a comparison can be made between men and women of the sample.

Individualism. The women's lower score on the individualism index indicates that women are more collectivistic than men, thus supporting the first hypothesis. As both scores were between 0 and 100, a constant was not added. As a result, the individualism index scores of the sample are low in comparison to the U.S. individualism index score of 91 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004).

Power Distance. Women's higher score on the power distance index implies women are more accepting that inequities of power exist than men, thereby supporting hypothesis two. As both scores were between 0 and 100, a constant was not added. The sample score for women is close to the U.S. power distance index score of 40 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). In addition, men in the sample scored higher on power distance than individualism, contrary to Hofstede's (1984) findings that U.S. participants scored highest on individualism.

Masculinity. Women scored higher on the masculinity index than men demonstrating women are more accepting of distinct gender role differentiation than men, thereby contradicting hypothesis three. However, the difference is less than half a percentage point. A constant was not added as both scores are between 0 and 100. The index score of the sample is low in comparison to the U.S. index score of 62 for masculinity (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). Hofstede and Hofstede reported the greatest gender difference on the masculinity index; however, in the sample, men and women differed least on the masculinity index.

Uncertainty Avoidance. Women's higher score on the uncertainty avoidance index means women have a higher need for predictability and "feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004, p. 167) more often than men. As both women's and men's scores were less than zero, a constant of 100 was added. The sample score for women matched the U.S. uncertainty avoidance index score of 46 (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). The men and women of the sample differed most, of the four dimensions, on uncertainty avoidance.

Chapter V

Discussion

The U.S. ranked 19th of 74 countries on the masculinity scale, with the 1st being the most masculine (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). The data confirms the distinct "emotional gender roles" (p. 120) that are representative of masculine countries. Although the current study had several problems and limitations, the findings demonstrate a need to gain a deeper understanding of the role of gender in relation to the dimensions of national cultures.

Problems and Limitations. Hofstede et al. (2008) suggested a matched sample of 50 respondents is ideal and "sample sizes smaller than 20 should not be used" to prevent "outlying answers by single respondents" (pp. 2-3) from skewing the results. The current sample of 36 men and 37 women is not an ideal size, but does fall within the suggested parameters. The type of employment and level of education were not controlled for, as the sample was too small to do so. However, over 62% of the sample matched on education and age, and over 86% self-identified as "American," making the sample, if not perfectly matched, more alike than different.

A small percentage (less than 8%) of those contacted chose to participate in the study. Marcus, Bosnjak, Lindner, Pilischenko, and Schütz (2007), in a controlled experimental design, compared response rates to web-based surveys with a high salient topic and low salient topic. The highly salient topic had a 30.3% response rate whereas the low salient topic had a response rate of 19%. As the recruitment message of the current study referred to "Revisiting cultural dimensions," language that is not commonly

used or understood outside of the communication discipline, there is no reason to expect the topic would be highly salient to Facebook users. The number of Fort Lauderdale residents on Facebook is also unknown, so it is impossible to make conclusions as to the representativeness of the sample to the rest of the population. The use of Facebook as a recruitment tool further distinguishes the sample from those who do not use Facebook. In addition, Facebook's constraints on the frequency of messages limited the researcher's ability to obtain a larger sample size within the time period of data collection; without the limitations, more individuals would have been contacted and a larger sample size could have been generated.

The survey itself, although used extensively, perhaps has limited validity to the constructs it is trying to measure. One participant sent the author an email suggesting "pride" was the wrong word to use in relation to one's feeling about the country in which one resides. He felt "pride" indicates a feeling one has in relation to personal achievement, not a feeling toward the society one belongs. Hence, the work-related questions of the survey might not be relevant to the values one holds in non-work situations.

"One request made of the new VSM version was that it should also be relevant to respondents without employers, such as entrepreneurs, students, and housewives" (Hofstede, 2001, p. 494). The researcher made a special attempt to include stay-at-home mothers ("housewives" is no longer a culturally relevant term) in the research because the researcher hypothesized that their increased dependency on a partner would differentiate their scores from women working for pay, and also increase the difference between

women and men. In addition, stay-at-home mothers more strongly exemplify gender role differentiation. The researcher contacted a MOMS Club located in east Fort Lauderdale. MOMS is a social group for stay-at-home mothers and plans activities to alleviate the relative isolation of stay-at-home mothers. The president of the club asked to review the survey in advance before providing the researcher with access to her members. After her review, she forwarded the following:

> Thank you for sharing your survey with us. We are declining to participate in your survey because it is not respectful to our members.
>
> Your survey has no opportunity to respond that a member has chosen to be a stay-at-home mother, and all questions presume that everyone is either working for pay or a student.
>
> Obviously there is a very large population you are missing and the wording of your questions makes it impossible for our members to answer in any meaningful way.
>
> Therefore, we decline your offer to participate and you do not have permission to contact our chapters or members. If you do so without our assistance, we will notify them that your study is unauthorized and does not respect their life choice.

In her viewpoint, the questions on the VSM08 were irrelevant to her, and her members', social situation.

Future Implications. The U.S Census Bureau (2010), based on 2009 data, estimated that females are 50.7% of the national population. Hofstede and Hofstede (2004) acknowledged that men and women are "biologically distinct" (p. 116) and "their respective roles in biological procreation are absolute" (pp. 116-117). Hofstede and Hofstede suggested that the biological differences in procreation created distinct gender roles in primitive societies. Pregnant women needed protection to give birth to healthy offspring and then needed to stay close to the child during breastfeeding. These biological differences made it easier for men to venture from the home, according to the biological

differences argument. The author challenges this explanation because if men were venturing from the home, then how could they be protecting women? In a contradictory statement, Hofstede and Hofstede acknowledged a "wide variety of social sex roles seem to be possible" even in "nonliterate, relatively isolated societies" (p. 117). In the biological procreation argument, women's contribution to the social system is the birth and nurturing of future members of the system, the very continuation of the system. "If we recognize that within each society there is a men's culture that differs from a women's culture" (p. 34), assuming the validity of the argument, then using "men's culture" to describe a social system ignores the vital contribution of "women's culture."

As animals were first domesticated for food thousands of years ago, the biological advantages of men as hunters is a weak argument for distinct gender roles. Since Hofstede's original IBM data were collected, between 1968-1972, women's access to resources has changed, with the representation of women in the paid labor force increasing from 35.3% in 1969 to 49.9% in 2009 (Shriver & Center for American Progress, 2009). A sampling of workplaces in the U.S. today would certainly yield a greater representation of women and a comparison of the results to the original index scores for the U.S would be informative. The current results, although from a small sample, indicates distinct differences from Hofstede's original results.

In the current study, women and men differed least on the masculinity dimension, with women scoring less than a half percentage point higher on the dimension than men. This result is contrary to Hofstede's (1984, 2001) findings; he reported masculinity as the only dimension with significant gender differences. Using Hofstede's definition of a

masculine society as one with "distinct gender roles," women may have scored higher because they are more cognizant of the role differentiation between genders than men. Alternatively, in the intervening years between Hofstede's sample and the current study, perceptions regarding gender roles may have changed. The Equal Pay Act, which "prohibits sex-based wage discrimination," was passed in 1963 (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2010). Additional legislation has been passed during the intervening years to protect women against discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, sexual harassment, and, in the private sphere, the Violence Against Women Act in 1994, making domestic violence and sexual assault crimes (Roe, 2004). These, in addition to other legislative efforts, may have created at least a veneer of equality between women and men, thus narrowing the perceived gap between gender roles. Further research is clearly needed to determine the differences, if they exist, between women and men on the masculinity dimension.

In the current study, of the four dimensions, men scored highest on power distance. In contrast, Hofstede (1984, 2001) reported that U.S. participants scored highest on individualism, and second highest on masculinity. A possible explanation for this may be that the current U.S. economic recession has changed the way men view power in the social system. The U.S. unemployment rate in 1969 averaged 3.5% (Data 360, 2010) whereas the Florida unemployment rate in May 2010 was 11.7% (Pounds, 2010). This high unemployment rate may have created doubt in the American work ethic of hard work reaps economic reward. A lack of opportunity seems to be the cause of unemployment in 2010, rather than a lack of industriousness. Of course, other possible

explanations exist. Perhaps men's values on the power distance dimension have remained unchanged, but men's values on the individualism and masculinity dimensions have changed, thus changing the rank order of the power distance dimension. Although Hofstede argued, and social systems theory supports, that the dimensions of a system are enduring and slow to change, neither rejects that systems evolve following political and social upheaval. The increased participation of women in the paid labor force and the Great Recession, as the economic period between December 2007 and June 2009 (National Bureau of Economic Research) has been labeled, could be the necessary catalyst to force the evolution of the system. Alternatively, the differences could simply be a function of the constant Hofstede applied to his results. The applied constant for the VSM94 (Hofstede, 2001, p. 494) was as follows: individualism (+130), power distance (-20), masculinity (+100), and uncertainty avoidance (+120). As the constant was not consistent across the dimensions, the highest dimension might have been a function of the constant rather than a representation of culture.

Women perform two-thirds of the world's unpaid work and are the primary caretakers; U.S. women engage in care-taking labor, on average, 17 hours a week more than men (Shriver & Center for American Progress, 2009). As caretakers, women are significant contributors to the socialization that reproduces national culture. The question becomes, do women want male dominance, as Hofstede and Hofstede (2004) suggest, and thus socialize the young to continue the existing cultural values, or does men's culture create a constraint on women's ability to socialize youngsters for gender equity? In addition, how significant is the socialization mothers provide? Children are formally

educated outside the home, and the educational system is also a substantial socializing force. In addition, the impact of media continues to grow and children are exposed to media even before they enter the education system. Future research investigating the contributions of women's unpaid labor to the social system and the impact of women's care-taking on socialization is necessary for a richer understanding of national culture.

Women scored highest on uncertainty avoidance and women's significant unpaid labor could be a factor. If women do not receive resources in exchange for labor contributions, women are dependent, not on their own initiative, but on men dispensing a share of resources. Minimal access and control over resources creates feelings of uncertainty. Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs states that biological and safety needs must be satisfied before higher level needs of esteem and self-actualization can be realized. Salzburg's (2009) comment that women look for deeper meanings when none exist may be due to their need to reduce relationship uncertainty, as a relationship is necessary for economic security.

Hofstede and Hofstede (2004) suggested that the social class that controls institutions (educational, governmental, and economic) creates national culture. This controlling class, in his estimation, is the middle class. Social systems theory supports the significance of institutions in a social system. Women, because of increased labor participation, are more prevalent in our institutions than at any time in history. Women hold 51% of management, administrative, and professional positions (White House Project, 2009). However, women are greatly underrepresented in the top leadership positions, comprising just 18% of leaders. The individual sectors analyzed by this report

are: academia, business, film and television entertainment, journalism, law, military, nonprofit, politics, religion, and sports. The leadership representation of women ranged from a low of 11% in the military to a high of 23% in academia. Women's inability to access top leadership positions could be a contributing factor to women's higher power distance index score compared to men. Simply put, those who lack power are more likely to be aware of power differentials than those who have power.

Additional research is needed to examine the implications of women's minimal leadership representation and how this affects national culture. Women's comparative inability to influence the direction of institutions, which are an integral component of national culture, might additionally constrain women's ability to influence national culture.

Women's higher index scores on the dimensions of uncertainty avoidance and power distance offer an explanation for women's interdependent self-construal and greater collectivistic tendencies in comparison to men. Although women have made dramatic strides in workforce participation, men still control a greater share of resources and institutions, thereby maintaining women's need for commitment formation. Interdependent behaviors are efficient strategies for the development of committed relationships, thus ensuring social status and economic security. According to Wolf (1975):

> The primary role of the woman is sexual and domestic; that of a man is occupational. Thus, the world of work, of public responsibility and control is

> forever the world of man; the world of tribal closeness, of house and family, of dependence and passivity abidingly belongs to woman. (p. 49)

In conclusion, women and men in the sample exhibited differences on the dimensions of national culture, supporting the proposition of a men's culture that differs from women's culture (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2004). Specifically, women were more collectivistic than men and scored higher on the dimensions of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity. These findings are contrary to Hofstede's (1984) results in which the masculinity/femininity dimension was the only dimension with a demonstrable gender difference. Are the approximately 10,000 IBM women (approximately 8% of the overall 117,000 research participants in Hofstede's study) a sufficient sample to include women's estimated $11 trillion contribution to the social system? Can an "integrated social system" be classified by dimensions based on a "category of people" (Hofstede & Hofstede, p.34), in this case, men? Perhaps when women and men are equally represented, gender differences are more apparent.

In a conference presentation of an interim version of this thesis, a conference attendee informed the researcher, "Hofstede is passé." However a third edition of Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind has just been released (unfortunately too late to be included in the current study) and www.geert-hofstede.com offers a software application for the popular iPhone entitled CultureGPS Professional (Hofstede, 2010b).

> CultureGPS Professional is an intelligent and easy-to-use iPhone tool that enables you to analyze behavior differences in intercultural encounters and to predict to a

> certain degree, which interactions evolve when people from different nationalities meet and work together. (home page)

Cultural dimensions have moved from academia into the mainstream so we must seek to understand the variables contributing to differences in national cultures. Additionally, we must include women equally, both as research subjects and researchers, in our theories of human behavior.

Appendix A

V S M 08

VALUES SURVEY MODULE 2008
QUESTIONNAIRE
English language version

Release 08-01, January 2008

hofstede@bart.nl; www.geerthofstede.nl

INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE (VSM 08)- page 1

Please think of an ideal job, disregarding your present job, if you have one. In choosing an ideal job, how important would it be to you to ... (please circle one answer in each line across):

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

01. have sufficient time for your personal or home life	1	2	3	4	5
02. have a boss (direct superior) you can respect	1	2	3	4	5
03. get recognition for good performance	1	2	3	4	5
04. have security of employment	1	2	3	4	5
05. have pleasant people to work with	1	2	3	4	5
06. do work that is interesting	1	2	3	4	5
07. be consulted by your boss in decisions involving your work	1	2	3	4	5
08. live in a desirable area	1	2	3	4	5
09. have a job respected by your family and friends	1	2	3	4	5
10. have chances for promotion	1	2	3	4	5

In your private life, how important is each of the following to you: (please circle one answer in each line across):

11. keeping time free for fun	1	2	3	4	5
12. moderation: having few desires	1	2	3	4	5
13. being generous to other people	1	2	3	4	5
14. modesty: looking small, not big	1	2	3	4	5

INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE (VSM 08) – page 2

15. If there is something expensive you really want to buy but you do not have enough money, what do you do?
    1. always save before buying
    2. usually save first
    3. sometimes save, sometimes borrow to buy
    4. usually borrow and pay off later
    5. always buy now, pay off later

16. How often do you feel nervous or tense?
    1. always
    2. usually
    3. sometimes
    4. seldom
    5. never

17. Are you a happy person?
    1. always
    2. usually
    3. sometimes
    4. seldom
    5. never

18. Are you the same person at work (or at school if you're a student) and at home?
    1. quite the same
    2. mostly the same
    3. don't know
    4. mostly different
    5. quite different

19. Do other people or circumstances ever prevent you from doing what you really want to?
    1. yes, always
    2. yes, usually
    3. sometimes
    4. no, seldom
    5. no, never

20. All in all, how would you describe your state of health these days?
    1. very good
    2. good
    3. fair
    4. poor
    5. very poor

21. How important is religion in your life?
    1. of utmost importance
    2. very important
    3. of moderate importance
    4. of little importance
    5. of no importance

INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE (VSM 08) – page 3

22. How proud are you to be a citizen of your country?

1. not proud at all
2. not very proud
3. somewhat proud
4. fairly proud
5. very proud

23. How often, in your experience, are subordinates afraid to contradict their boss (or students their teacher?)

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

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? (please circle one answer in each line across):

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

24. One can be a good manager without having a precise answer to every question that a subordinate may raise about his or her work	1	2	3	4	5
25. Persistent efforts are the surest way to results	1	2	3	4	5
26. An organization structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all cost	1	2	3	4	5
27. A company's or organization's rules should not be broken - not even when the employee thinks breaking the rule would be in the organization's best interest	1	2	3	4	5
28. We should honour our heroes from the past	1	2	3	4	5

INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE (VSM 08)- page 4

Some information about yourself (for statistical purposes):

29. Are you:
    1. male
    2. female

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

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

32. If you have or have had a paid job, what kind of job is it / was it?
    1. No paid job (includes full-time students)
    2. Unskilled or semi-skilled manual worker
    3. Generally trained office worker or secretary
    4. Vocationally trained craftsperson, technician, IT-specialist, nurse, artist or equivalent
    5. Academically trained professional or equivalent (but not a manager of people)
    6. Manager of one or more subordinates (non-managers)
    7. Manager of one or more managers

33. What is your nationality?

    _____

34. What was your nationality at birth (if different?)

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

Appendix B

What is your residential zip code? _____

What is your relationship status? (Please check one)

____ Cohabiting relationship ____ Legally married

____ Single ____ Divorced

____ Widowed ____ Other:_____

How many children do you have? (Please check one)

____ 0 ____ 3-4

____ 1-2 ___ 5 or more

I am: (Please check ALL that apply)

____ Full-time student

____ Part-time student

____ Employed full-time

____ Employed part-time

____ Currently unemployed but seeking employment

____ Full-time caretaker (such as caring for children or elderly relatives)

____ Retired

____ Currently on disability/worker's comp leave

____ Currently on maternity/parental leave

____ None of the above

Appendix C

Dear Research Participant:

Thank you for being willing to participate in the research study titled Revisiting Cultural Dimensions. For research purposes, you must be between the ages of 25 and 59 and live in the City of Fort Lauderdale for your answers to be included in the final results. To complete the survey successfully proficiency with the English language is required. The research is being conducted by Christine Willingham, a student in the Communication Department at Barry University who is completing her Master's Thesis, and is seeking information that will be useful in the field of Intercultural Communication.

The following procedure will be used: You will be requested to complete an online survey. A link to the questionnaire, via a website known as SurveyMonkey, follows this letter. I anticipate the number of participants to be approximately 200.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to do the following: Answer the questions on the survey. The questionnaire is estimated to take no more than 10 minutes to complete.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects.

The risks of involvement in this study are minimal. There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this study; however, your participation will contribute to research in the area of intercultural communication and help a student complete her degree.

As a research participant, information you provide is anonymous, that is, no names or other identifiers will be collected. SurveyMonkey.com allows researchers to suppress the delivery of IP addresses during the downloading of data, and in this study no IP address will be delivered to the researcher. However, SurveyMonkey.com does collect IP addresses for its own purposes. If you have concerns about this you should review the privacy policy of SurveyMonkey.com before you begin.

The researcher and her faculty advisor have sole access to survey results. Data will be stored for two years in a locked cabinet at Barry University in the office of Dr. Margaret K. Chojnacki, Department of Communication.

By completing and submitting this electronic survey you are acknowledging that you are between the ages of 25 and 59 and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Christine Willingham, by phone at 954-818-3223 or by email at Christine.willingham@mymail.barry.edu You may also contact the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Barbara Cook, by phone at (305) 899-3020 or by email at bcook@mail.barry.edu.

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix D

Dear Sir/Madam:

My name is Christine Willingham, and I am graduate a student in the Communication Department at Barry University. I am completing my Master's Thesis, titled Revisiting Cultural Dimensions, and I am requesting your help.

If you decide to assist me in this research, you will be asked to do the following: Forward an email from me requesting your members' participation in this research study. The members will not be asked to respond to me directly and no identifying information will be collected. Your members will be asked to complete an online survey at SurveyMonkey.com. If you also wish to participate in the survey, please feel free to do so.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Christine Willingham, by phone at 954-818-3223 or by email at Christine.willingham@mymail.barry.edu You may also contact the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Barbara Cook, by phone at (305) 899-3020 or by email at bcook@mail.barry.edu.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Christine Willingham

Appendix E

Dear Research Participant:

If you are between the ages of 25 and 59 and live in the City of Fort Lauderdale, I am requesting your help in a research project. The title of the study is Revisiting Cultural Dimensions. The research is being conducted by Christine Willingham, a student in the Communication Department at Barry University completing her Master's Thesis, and is seeking information that will be useful in the field of Intercultural Communication. You must be proficient with the English language to complete the survey successfully.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to do the following: Answer the questions on a survey. The questionnaire is estimated to take no more than 10 minutes to complete and can be accessed through a link at the bottom of this page.

This research project is not associated in any way with the group or association who forwarded the email to you; they have agreed to send it on simply as a courtesy to the researcher. The researcher and her faculty advisor will have sole access to the survey results.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Christine Willingham, by phone at 954-818-3223 or by email at Christine.willingham@mymail.barry.edu You may also contact the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Barbara Cook, by phone at (305) 899-3020 or by email at bcook@mail.barry.edu.

Thank you for your participation. To access the survey, click here:

_____

Sincerely,

Christine Willingham

References

The Applied History Research Group. (1997). The European voyages of exploration. University of Calgary. Retrieved from: http://www.ucalgary.ca/applied_history/tutor/eurvoya/columbus.html

Axelrod, R., & Hamilton, W. D. (1981). The evolution of cooperation. Science, 211(4489), p. 1390-1396.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. M. (1985). Epistemological development and the politics of talk in family life. Journal of Education, 167(3), 9-27.

Belkin, L. (2009, September 30). The new gender gap. The New York Times Magazine. Retrieved from: http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/04/magazine/04FOB-wwln-t.html?_r=2

Bell, D. (1997). Defining marriage and legitimacy. Current Anthropology, 38, 237-244.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2010a). Employment characteristics of families – 2009. Retrieved from: http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/famee.pdf

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010b). May 2008 National occupational employment and wage estimates. Retrieved from: http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm

Cha, Y., & Thébaud, S. (2009). Labor markets, breadwinning, and beliefs: How economic context shapes gender ideology. Gender & Society, 23, 215-243.

Caiazza, A. (2002-2003). The status of women in the states. Washington D.C. Institute for Women's Policy Research. Retrieved from: http://www.iwpr.org/states2002/pdfs/US.pdf

Chojnacki, M. K. (2001). Cultural differences in game theory: Proposed variability of the individualist and the collectivist in prisoner's dilemma (Unpublished master's thesis). University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York.

Community Property – Then and Now (1947). Congressional Digest, 26, 294-295.

Crittenden, A. (2001). The price of motherhood: Why the most important job in the world is still the least valued. New York, NY: Metropolitan.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. Psychological Bulletin, 122, 5-37.

Data 360 (2010). Unemployment rate U.S. Retrieved from: http://www.data360.org/dsg.aspx?Data_Set_Group_Id=248&count=all

Edlund, L., & Pande, R. (2002). Why have women become left-wing? The political gender gap and the decline in marriage. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 117, 917-961.

English, A., Hartmann, H., & Hegewisch, A. (2009). Unemployment among single mother families. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research. Retrieved from: http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/SingleMotherUE_C369.pdf

English, A., & Hegewisch, A. (2008). Still a man's labor market: The long-term earnings gap. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Fiske, A. P. (2002). Using individualism and collectivism to compare cultures – A critique of the validity and measurement of the constructs: Comment on Osyerman et al., 2002. Psychological Bulletin, 128, 78-88.

Form, W. H., & Rytina, J. (1969). Ideological beliefs on the distribution of power in the United States. American Sociological Review, 34, 19-31.

Fortune. (2010). Global 500. Retrieved from: http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/global500/2010/index.html

Friedan, B. (1963). The feminine mystique, New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Friedan, B. (1997, Reprint). The feminine mystique, New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. New York: Doubleday.

Hartmann, H., Hegewisch, A., Liepmann, H., & Williams, C. (2009). The gender wage gap: 2008. Washington D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research. Retrieved from: http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/C350.pdf

Hartmann, H., Spalter-Roth, R., & Sills, M. (2003). Survival at the bottom: The income packages of low-income families with children. Washington D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research. Retrieved from: http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/D453.pdf

Hays, S. (1998). The cultural contradictions of motherhood. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hegewisch, A. (2010). The gender wage gap by occupation. Washington D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research. Retrieved from: http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/C350a.pdf

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related Values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related Values. Abridged Edition, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2010a). What are Hofstede's five cultural dimensions? Retrieved from: http://www.geert-hofstede.com/

Hofstede, G. (2010b). CultureGPS Professional. Retrieved from: http://www.geert-hofstede.com/

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2004). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., Minkov, M. (2010). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., Minkov, M., & Vinken, H. (2008). Values survey module 2008 manual. Retrieved from: http://www.geert-hofstede.com/

Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S., Gelfand, M. J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 925-937.

Kollock, P. (1994). The emergence of exchange structures: An experimental study of uncertainty, commitment, and trust. The American Journal of Sociology, 100, p. 313-345.

Kollock, P., Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1985). Sex and power in interaction: Conversational privileges and duties. American Sociological Review, 50, 34-46.

Kornbluh, K., & Homer, R. (2009). Paycheck feminism: With women now making up the bulk of the U.S. paid workforce, it's time to rethink government policies that were designed for a very different time. Here are five ways to better value women's work. Ms. Magazine, Fall 2009, pp. 28-33. Retrieved from: http://msmagazine.com/Fall2009/PaycheckFeminism.pdf

Luhmann, N. (1995). Social systems. (J. Bednarz, Jr. & D. Baecker, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1998). Love as passion: The codification of intimacy. (J. Gaines & D. L. Jones, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Marcus, B., Bosnjak, M., Lindner, S., Pilischenko, S., & Schütz, A. (2007). Compensating for low topic interest and long surveys: A field experiment on nonresponse in web surveys. Social Science Computer Review, 25, 372-383. doi: 10.1177/0894439307297606

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-253.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). Motivation and personality. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

McLuhan, M., & Powers, B. (1989). The global village: Transformations in world life and media in the 21st century. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Moulettes, A. (2007). The absence of women's voices in Hofstede's Cultural Consequences: A postcolonial reading. Women in Management Review, 22, 443-455.

National Bureau of Economic Research (2010). Last four recessions and their durations. Retrieved from: http://www.nber.org/

National Marriage Project. (2007). The state of our unions. Charlottesville, VA. Retrieved from: http://www.virginia.edu/marriageproject/pdfs/SOOU2007.pdf

Pounds, M. H. (2010, June 20). Florida unemployment rate fell to 11.7 percent in May. Sun-Sentinel. Retrieved from: http://articles.sun-sentinel.com

Richardson, L. (1988). Secrecy and status: The social construction of forbidden relationships. American Sociological Review, 53, 209-219.

Roe, K. J. (2004). The violence against women act and its impact on sexual violence public policy: Looking back and looking forward. Retrieved from: http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/VAWA-SVPubPol.pdf

Salzburg, C. (2009). He said, she heard. ForbesWoman. Retrieved from: http://www.forbes.com/2009/11/24/men-women-relationships-forbes-woman-time-language.html

Schroeder, S. (2009). Facebook users are getting older. Much older. Mashable: The Social Media Guide. Retrieved from http://mashable.com/2009/07/07/facebook-users-older/

Shinada, M., Yamagishi, T., & Ohmura, Y. (2004). False friends are worse than bitter enemies: "Altruistic" punishment of in-group members. Evolution and Human Behavior, 25, 379-393.

Shriver, M., & Center for American Progress. (2009). The Shriver report: A woman's nation changes everything. Washington D.C.: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from: http://www.awomansnation.com/

Statutes Governing Property Today. (1947). Congressional Digest, 26, 296-297.

Szegedy-Masak, M. (2001). Guess who's footing the 'mommy tax? No, motherhood doesn't pay, but should it? U.S. News & World Report, 130(11), 48.

UNICEF (2007). Gender equality-The big picture Retrieved from: http://www.unicef.org/gender/index_bigpicture.html

United Nations Development Programme. (1995). Human development report. Retrieved from: http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1995_en_contents.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau (2010). State and county quick facts. Retrieved from: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2010). The equal pay act of 1963. Retrieved from: http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/epa.cfm

White House Project. (2009). Benchmarking women's leadership. New York City, NY.

Wilcox, B. (2009a). The evolution of divorce. Charlottesville, VA: The National Marriage Project. Retrieved from: http://www.virginia.edu/marriageproject/pdfs/Wilcox_Fall09.pdf

Wilcox, B. (2009b). The great recession's silver lining? Charlottesville, VA: The National Marriage Project. Retrieved from: http://www.virginia.edu/marriageproject/pdfs/Unions_Wilcox.pdf

Wolf, C. (1975). Sex roles as portrayed in marriage and the family textbooks: Contributions to the status quo. Women's Studies, 3, 45-60.

Yamagishi, T. (1988). The provision of a sanctioning system in the United States and Japan. Social Psychology Quarterly, 51, 265-271.

Yamagishi, T., Cook, K. S., & Watabe, M. (1998). Uncertainty, trust, and commitment formation in the Unites States and Japan. The American Journal of Sociology, 104, 165-194.

Young, N. (2009). Women earn less than men in nearly all occupations. Institute for Women's Policy Research Newsletter. Washington, D.C., Summer/Fall 2009, 4.