Open Access | Original Research
Journal of Intercultural Communication, 26(1), 2026 | PP: 103– 114
https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v26i1.1312

Re-Examining The Validity of Hofstede's Power Distance Dimension: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Organizational Employees In Four Countries

Jung-Soo Yi[1]

Article History:

Received: 12-09-2025
Revision: 16-11-2025
Accepted: 12-12-2025
Publication: 04-05-2026

Cite this article as:

Yi, J. (2026). Re-Examining The Validity of Hofstede's Power Distance Dimension: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Organizational Employees In Four Countries. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 26(1), 103-114. doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v26i1.1312

Corresponding Author:

Jung-Soo Yi

School of Social Sciences and International Studies, Wright State University, Ohio, United States.
Email: Jung-soo.yi@wright.edu

Abstract: The present study examines the contemporary validity and applicability of Hofstede's power distance dimension. Since the introduction of Hofstede's cultural value framework in the early 1980s, cultural, social, political, and commercial relationships among countries have undergone substantial transformation. These changes may have influenced how individuals perceive and enact power relations across intercultural contexts, making a re-examination of the power distance dimension both timely and necessary. Data were collected using a questionnaire that was developed, pilot-tested, and administered to 2,000 organizational members in Mexico, France, Great Britain, and New Zealand. The data were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings indicate that cultural differences in power distance across the four countries persist; however, the magnitude of these differences is less pronounced than Hofstede's original national rankings suggest. This pattern points to a narrowing of power distance gaps among countries while reaffirming the continued relevance of the dimension. The study contributes to intercultural communication research by highlighting the dynamic nature of cultural values and the need for context-sensitive interpretations of power distance. Future research should incorporate additional variables such as education, organizational position, religion, and degree of intercultural contact to provide a more comprehensive understanding of evolving power distance orientations.

Keywords: Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions, Power Distance, Cross-Cultural Comparison, Organizational Employees, Intercultural communication, National culture, Gender differences

1. Introduction

Later considered a pioneer and pathfinder of cultural comparisons (Søndergaard, 1994), Hofstede (1980) introduced cultural value dimensions that have become one of the most influential contributions to the study of cross-cultural differences (Cooper, Calloway-Thomas, & Simonds, 2007). These dimensions include individualism and collectivism, power distance, masculinity and femininity, and uncertainty avoidance. As one of the earliest attempts to examine cultural values (Samovar, Porter, McDaniel, & Roy, 2017), this comparative approach shaped the basic themes of cross-cultural studies (Peterson, 2003) and became a good starting point for understanding cultural values (Chen & Starosta, 1998). Although Hofstede intended to conceptualize work-related values of organizational members (Hofstede, 1980), these dimensions have branched out to explore various cultural topics related to psychology (e.g., Sivasubramaniam & Goodman-Delahunty, 2011), communication (e.g., Madlock, 2012), organizational studies (e.g., Ghosh, 2011), medicine (e.g., Jippes & Majoor, 2011), marketing (e.g., Kim & Zhang, 2014), and the general social sciences (Smith, 2002).

Hofstede's work initially measured cultural characteristics at a national level (Samovar, Porter, McDaniel, & Roy, 2017). However, the power distance dimension has expanded to analyze organizational and social circumstances from various perspectives, including the individual level (e.g., Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001), societal level (e.g., Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995), national level (e.g., Fischer, 2009), and cross-cultural level (e.g., Erez, 2011). These approaches have conceptualized and measured the extent of power distance across various social categories (Daniels & Greguras, 2014). For example, the power distance dimension has been most frequently used to investigate organizational-level phenomena in terms of acceptance of power (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009), leadership (Pasa, 2000), employee productivity (Paquin, Roch, & Sanchez-Ku, 2007), management development (Khatri, 2009), and many other organizational issues. In addition, as scholarly attention turned toward diversity management in the workplace during the 1990s (Sorrells, 2013), this bipolar continuum became a valuable tool for exploring specific cultural issues at the individual level, such as job satisfaction (Hauff & Richter, 2015), attitude and behavior (Ng, Sorenson, & Yim, 2009), employee participation (Rafiei & Pourreza, 2013), empowerment (Zhang & Begley, 2011), employee motivation (Zhao & Pan, 2017), prejudices and discrimination (Patrick & Kumar, 2012), and other issues connected to cultural influences on individual behavior. Moreover, cross-cultural-level comparisons have offered valuable guidelines for individuals involved in international encounters (e.g., Wu, 2006; Scholtens & Dam, 2007).

Along with earlier attempts to identify and categorize cultural patterns (e.g., Parsons & Shills, 1951; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Inkeles & Levinson, 1969), Hofstede's cultural framework made a significant impact on cultural studies and became the most widely used

[1] School of Social Sciences and International Studies, Wright State University, Ohio, "United State".

(Ghosh, 2011) and recognized (Gong, Li, & Stump, 2007) concept for understanding national culture. However, it did not escape critical challenges. Scholars have disputed that Hofstede's study assumed domestic populations were homogeneous (Redpath & Nielsen, 1997), thereby ignoring variations within countries (DiMaggio, 1997). Others argued that theoretical constructs require re-examination (Orr & Hauser, 2008) and that "his data do not span a sufficient time interval to permit a valid test" (Smith, 2002, p. 127). In addition, sampling was criticized as flawed due to unevenly distributed participants across nations (McSweeney, 2000), which led to oversimplification of cultural differences (Signorini, Wiesemes, & Murphy, 2009). Furthermore, the study has been criticized as outdated and of limited contemporary value (Wu, 2006; Beugelsdijk & Welzel, 2018). Regardless of these criticisms, other scholars have defended dimensional studies as appropriate for conceptualizing and operationalizing culture (Keillor & Hult, 1999; Steenkamp, 2001), and HHofstede'swork is still considered one of the most comprehensive and relevant studies of cultural differences (Holden, 2004).

1.1. Power Distance

Power distance is the degree to which people in a culture accept (Sorrells, 2013), tolerate (Cooper, Calloway-Thomas, & Simonds, 2007), and adapt (Chen & Starosta, 1998) to the unequal distribution of power in relationships, institutions, and organizations. Recognizing that individuals do not possess equal levels of status or social power (Lustig & Koester, 2006), people tend to act (Beamer & Varner, 2001) and interact (Javidan & House, 2001) accordingly, based on their power positions within families (Klopf, 1998), schools (Yoo, 2014), organizations (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkow, 2010), and even friendships (Neuliep, 2015).

Different degrees of power distance tendencies exist across cultures (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003), but vertical or horizontal (Chen & Starosta, 1998) structures of social relationships tend to prevail. In high power distance cultures (e.g., the Philippines, Mexico, and Venezuela), where power and authority are facts of life (Samovar & Porter, 2001), people tend to accept hierarchical order (Klyukanov, 2005) and believe that authority figures should be respected (Yang, Mossholder, & Peng, 2007), trusted (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009), and obeyed (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994). Consequently, people expect a high degree of power centralization in organizations (Adler, 1997), and employees tend not to question their superiors' orders (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003), often feeling afraid and unwilling to express disagreement (Hofstede, 2001). Similarly, children's opinions are often excluded from family decision-making processes (Calzada, Fernandez, & Cortes, 2010), and they are expected to obey their parents without challenge (Lustig & Koester, 2006), sometimes under the threat of corporal punishment (Westby, 2007). In educational settings, students are expected to be modest and deferential in the presence of teachers (Andersen, 2000), who are rarely contradicted or publicly criticized (Yoo, 2014). Moreover, individuals occupying specific professional roles (e.g., doctors, lawyers, professors) are held in high esteem (Fong & Chuang, 2004), reinforcing beliefs that hierarchy and inequality are appropriate and even beneficial for social functioning (Lustig & Koester, 2006).

In contrast, in countries with low power distance indices (e.g., Austria, Israel, and New Zealand), people believe that inequality in organizations (Yildirim & Deniz, 2014) and society (Samovar & Porter, 2001) should be minimized. Because social strata and hierarchical distinctions are less pronounced (Javidan & House, 2001), organizational power hierarchies are generally viewed as arrangements for convenience rather than authority (Borden, 1991; Neuliep, 2015), and power is expected to be exercised only for legitimate purposes (Martin & Nakayama, 2010). As people prefer democratic participation (Lu, Rose, & Blodgett, 1999), subordinates expect to be consulted before decisions affecting their work are made (Hofstede, 1993; Sagie & Aycan, 2003), and they may even resist decisions implemented without discussion (Brockner et al., 2001). This perception suggests that individuals in positions of power are more likely to share authority with those in lower positions (Madlock, 2012). Employees also tend to demonstrate strong work ethics (Klopf, 1998), whereas unethical behavior may remain hidden in high power distance cultures due to subordinate loyalty and submissiveness (Khatri, 2009). In addition, because family members are generally treated as equals (Neuliep, 2015), parents encourage children's independence (Klopf, 1998) and teach them to seek reasons or justification for family members' actions (Lustig & Koester, 2006). In schools, learning environments are typically student-centered (Yoo, 2014), and teachers treat students more as equals (Cortina, Arel, & Smith-Darden, 2017). Thus, "students are expected to ask questions and perhaps even challenge their teacher" (Neuliep, 2015, p. 82) with little fear of confrontation (Borden, 1991). In general, members of these societies tend to view one another as equals and prefer to interact within this paradigm (Yuan & Zhou, 2015).

With these traditionally practiced norms of cultural variability, perceptual changes are gradually surfacing in behavioral patterns, potentially shifting cultural gaps among countries. For example, the power distance index is lower among higher social classes in Britain than among working classes, although people generally continue to believe that inequalities should be minimized (Cook, 2023). However, strong cultural tendencies suggest that significant changes have not yet been fully measured. In New Zealand, individuals of different social statuses strive to minimize distinctions and often interact informally and socially (McCornack, 2010). Similarly, Mexican employees, despite being categorized as belonging to a high power distance culture, continue to believe that a clear understanding and application of power distance in communication behaviors are positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Madlock, 2012). Moreover, France continues to demonstrate relatively high power distance scores, indicating that French society still accepts specific degrees of inequality (Malhotra, 2021).

Most cross-cultural studies explore cultural phenomena and individuals' perceptual understanding of their environments to suggest improved communication skills or culturally informed guidelines. As "many cultures are in a stage of great transition" (Neuliep, 2015, p. 49), it is advisable to examine how power distance indices across countries may have changed and how these changes can be accurately assessed to offer more precise guidelines for individuals engaged in intercultural contexts.

1.2. Importance of Re-examining the Power Distance Dimension

Hofstede was the first scholar to quantify cultural orientations (Beugelsdijk & Welzel, 2018) through his original survey of cultural values initiated in the late 1960s (Cooper, Calloway-Thomas, & Simonds, 2007). Despite ongoing debates over its validity and usefulness, the cultural value framework has consistently guided scholars and multinational practitioners. At the turn of the new century, however, international interrelationships began to change significantly across multiple dimensions, partially due to advancements in transportation, technology, and media as countries became increasingly interconnected,

interactions and information exchange among people diversified, involving men, women, minorities, and immigrants who brought differing perceptions and values while working and residing in increasingly borderless cultural environments. Although cultural dimensions are often assumed to have centuries-old roots (Hofstede, 1998) and deep cultural structures are considered resistant to change (Samovar & Porter, 2001), there is growing speculation that findings from earlier studies should be re-examined in contemporary contexts (Wu, 2006; Beugelsdijk & Welzel, 2018).

Globalization and organizational diversity in rapidly changing international environments require more precise interpretations of cultural and individual values to improve organizational effectiveness (Thomas, 2008; Daniels & Greguras, 2014) and maximize employee contributions (Patrick & Kumar, 2012). For productive and healthy cultural interactions not only in organizational settings, but also in social, political, and educational contexts, understanding and applying Hofstede's cultural dimensions remains essential. Among these dimensions, power distance is particularly salient, as power is fundamental to all human relationships (Russell, 1938; Keltner, Gruenfield, & Anderson, 2003). With the increasing frequency of intercultural encounters, re-examining the power distance dimension is therefore necessary to assess its contemporary validity before offering updated guidelines for individuals operating within culturally interconnected societies. Previous scholarly efforts that clarified and emphasized the importance of cultural variation informed the objectives of the present study. By collecting and statistically analyzing data, this article aims to address the following research questions.

RQ1: *Do organizational members in Mexico and France (high power distance countries) present a higher degree of power distance tendencies than organizational members in Great Britain and New Zealand (low power distance countries)?*

Although Hofstede's original study focused primarily on power distance behaviors within organizational settings, more comprehensive outcomes may be achieved by incorporating multiple categories of power distance behaviors. Accordingly, the present study divides power distance into four subcategories—individual, family, organizational, and societal—and constructs questionnaire items based on these distinctions. Because previous research indicates that family behaviors (Wayne, Michel, & Matthews, 2022), including marital satisfaction (Tang, Huang, & Wang, 2017), significantly influence organizational attitudes, behaviors, and work–life balance, examining Hofstede's original findings across multiple influential contexts may provide more accurate guidance for understanding the power distance dimension.

RQ2: *Do organizational members in Mexico and France present a higher degree of power distance characteristics across the four subcategories than organizational members in Great Britain and New Zealand?*

2. Method

Because the present study used a newly developed questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted to assess the reliability and clarity of the items. A total of 138 participants were included in the pilot study (Mexican, N = 31; French, N = 32; English, N = 39; New Zealander, N = 36), using English, Spanish, and French versions of the questionnaire. After the pilot study, adjustments to sentence structures, rearrangement and regrouping of question items, and the use of more equivalent word choices were made for the main study. Because people's behavior may be expressed differently across various levels of interaction, the present research divided the question items into four categories: individual, family, organizational, and societal levels. Each category contained ten question items presented in no specific order in the questionnaire.

2.1. Respondents

To administer the questionnaire, forty-six international members of the National Communication Association (USA) were contacted. Twenty-eight scholars were unable to participate due to academic and personal reasons. Among those who participated, an insufficient number of members from the highest- and lowest-power-distance countries in Hofstede's original rankings were included. Among the countries for which scholars consented to participate, Mexico (2nd) and France (9th) were selected to represent high-power-distance countries. In contrast, Great Britain (31st) and New Zealand (37th) were identified as low-power-distance countries. Because geographical locations within a country may influence the practice of cultural values (Madlock, 2012; Yi, 2004), two cities were selected in each country based on population size.

Table 1 displays the number of respondents representing each country (N = 1,238; N = 702 males; N = 536 females). A total of 947 participants were employed in private organizations (N = 603 males; N = 344 females), and the remaining 291 participants were employed in government-related organizations (N = 128 males; N = 163 females). In Mexico, 128 participants were recruited from organizations in a large city (Puebla: N = 79 males; N = 49 females), and 174 respondents were recruited from organizations in a small town (Irapuato: N = 88 males; N = 86 females). In France, 131 participants were from organizations in a large city (Paris: N = 75 males; N = 56 females), and 162 participants were from organizations in a small town (Lyon: N = 79 males; N = 83 females). In Great Britain, 165 participants were recruited from organizations located in a large city (Birmingham: N = 92 males; N = 73 females), and 131 participants were from organizations in a small town (Bristol: N = 81 males; N = 50 females). In New Zealand, 163 participants were recruited from organizations in a large city (Auckland: N = 102 males; N = 61 females), and 184 participants were recruited from organizations in a small town (Hamilton: N = 106 males; N = 78 females). Seventy-two percent of participants (N = 891; N = 564 males; N = 327 females) indicated that they grew up and studied in cities similar to those in which they were currently employed. In addition, ninety-four percent of participants (N = 1,161; N = 653 males; N = 508 females) reported that their first language was the predominant or national language of their country of employment.

Table 1: Number of Respondents by Countries, City Sizes, and Gender

	Org. in a small city*		Org. in a large city**		Males	Females	Total
Mexico	(Irapuato)	174	(Puebla)	128	167	135	302
France	(Lyon)	162	(Paris)	131	154	139	293
Great Britain	(Bristol)	131	(Birmingham)	165	173	123	296
New Zealand	(Hamilton)	184	(Auckland)	163	208	139	347

*A city with a population of less than 500,000 people, **A city with more than 1,000,000 people in population

Age variations existed among respondents across the four countries. Mexican participants constituted the oldest group (average age = 39.4), followed by British respondents (average age = 37.6). The French participants were the youngest group

(average age = 31.6), and the New Zealanders were the second-youngest (average age = 33.8). The oldest participant was a Mexican female manager working at a local bank in Irapuato (55.6 years old), and the youngest respondent was also a Mexican female working at a department store in Puebla (20.2 years old).

2.2. Procedure

For both the pilot and the main study, the questionnaire was initially constructed in English and then translated into Spanish and French. Although 197 (65%) Mexican participants, 221 (75%) French participants, 231 (78%) participants from Great Britain, and 269 (78%) participants from New Zealand had college degrees, there was no guarantee that respondents in Mexico and France would clearly understand the terms used in the questionnaire. Therefore, a necessary step was taken to ensure respondents could express their thoughts without misunderstanding the language. After the translations were completed by Mexican and French native speakers who were professors in the modern languages department at a state university in the United States, back-translation procedures (Brislin, 1980) were conducted by other Mexican and French speakers who had not seen the original English version of the questionnaire. Although debates continue regarding the validity of translation in cross-cultural research (Bullinger, 2003; Ozolins, 2008), this methodology has been shown to be effective (Gudykunst et al., 1992; Houchin & Wild, 2006) when carefully administered. With the increase in cross-cultural research, many scholars have used this validation tool to produce more accurate findings (e.g., Ayyash-Abdo, 2001; Choi, Kushner, Mill, & Lai, 2012; Wu, 2006).

Of the 2,000 paper questionnaires distributed across eight locations in four countries, 1,284 were returned (a return rate of 64.2%), and 1,238 questionnaires (61.9%) were included in the statistical analysis. A total of 46 returned questionnaires were excluded for various reasons. 9 participants did not sign the consent form; 15 failed to answer demographic questions such as age, gender, or nationality; 12 respondents did not complete all 40 questionnaire items; and 10 participants reported nationalities that differed from their country of employment. Although there were no time restrictions for completing the questionnaire, respondents were advised not to interact or share ideas with others while completing the survey. This instruction was intended to prevent possible contamination or influence from other participants while respondents expressed their thoughts and ideas.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

Because the present study collected data from eight locations across four countries, a simple analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to compare calculated mean factor scores and determine whether statistically significant differences existed. Power distance level was the dependent variable, and the eight selected cities were the independent variables. After treating the total mean score for the forty items for each participant as a single unit of analysis, a second analysis was conducted in which the four subgroups of items were analyzed separately. Although demographic information was collected, gender and location within the country were the only variables included in the statistical analysis.

Scoring for some questionnaire items was reversed. In these cases, items were worded negatively so that disagreement indicated agreement with the positive version. The purpose of reverse scoring and the use of a balanced scale was to control acquiescent responding (Crocker & Algina, 1986), thereby encouraging respondents to discriminate more carefully among items. Despite early warnings about reducing ambiguity in question wording (Cronbach, 1946), criticism persists regarding negatively worded items, as scoring may be affected by respondent carelessness (Schmitt & Stults, 1985), mindless consistency (Drolet & Morrison, 2001), and confusion (Sonderen, Sanderman, & Coyne, 2013). Nevertheless, when carefully designed and implemented, the inclusion of both positively and negatively worded items can produce more adequately fitting statistical results (Horan, DiStefano, & Motl, 2003).

A Likert scale was used to collect data in the following format: "5" represented "strongly agree," "4" represented "agree," "3" represented "neutral," "2" represented "disagree," and "1" represented "strongly disagree." During data analysis, factor analysis was conducted to examine item groupings and to assess whether these groupings were consistent with findings from previous research. This method allowed the researchers to determine whether the results could be interpreted as indicators of the dimension the present study aimed to investigate. In addition, the reliability of each item was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal consistency. Finally, a Duncan Multiple Range test was conducted to examine specific differences between large pairs of means, followed by significant F-ratios to assess variations among group means.

3. Results

The findings of the present study confirmed the existence of perceptual and behavioral pattern differences in power distance among the four participating countries. Based on the statistically computed data, Research Question 1 was supported; however, Research Question 2, which examined four subcategories of power distance, yielded more nuanced results. Mexican participants presented the highest overall power distance predispositions (N = 302; M = 128.35; SD = 11.46), followed by French respondents (N = 293; M = 124.26; SD = 10.27), British organizational members (N = 296; M = 120.76; SD = 10.56), and New Zealanders (N = 347; M = 115.34; SD = 8.67). Table 2 indicates that these findings are consistent with Hofstede's original ranking of forty countries on the power distance dimension (Mexico #2, France #9, Great Britain #31, and New Zealand #37). The results are also consistent with recent studies showing that Mexican organizational employees hold high levels of power distance by acknowledging and emphasizing power and status differences (Madlock, 2012), and that French managers and subordinates continue to accept inequality in power distribution (Zheng, 2010).

Among the four countries, significant differences were found between Mexican and New Zealand participants, $F(1, 649) = 3.24$; $p = 0.005$, and between Mexican and British respondents, $F(1, 598) = 2.89$; $p = 0.005$. However, significant differences between male and female participants within the same country were not found in any of the four countries: Mexico, $F(1, 302) = 1.27$; $p = 0.054$; France, $F(1, 293) = 1.72$; $p = 0.05$; Great Britain, $F(1, 296) = 1.87$; $p = 0.059$; and New Zealand, $F(1, 347) = 1.34$; $p = 0.055$. Although scholars generally suggest that men's perceptions of power distance are higher than those of women (e.g., Terzi, 2004), the underlying causes and contributing factors of gender differences have been largely neglected in prior research.

Among male participants, the total score of Mexican organizational members was significantly higher than that of British respondents, $F(1, 340) = 2.78$; $p = 0.059$, and New Zealanders, $F(1, 375) = 3.25$; $p = 0.062$, findings that are generally consistent

with previous research. In contrast, among female participants, a statistically significant difference was observed only between Mexican and New Zealand females, F(1, 274) = 2.57; p = 0.060.

Table 2: Power Distance Differences among Four Countries

Countries	Number of Items/Possible score	Overall Mean Score (ranking)	Male Mean Score (ranking)	Female Mean Score (ranking)
Mexico	40/200	128.35 (1)	129.69 (1)	126.19 (1)
France	40/200	124.26 (2)	125.18 (2)	124.04 (2)
Great Britain	40/200	120.76 (3)	121.27 (3)	118.34 (3)
New Zealand	40/200	115.34 (4)	115.45 (4)	113.00 (4)

Source: Calculated by the author

Table 3 shows that Mexican organizational members in Irapuato presented the highest power distance tendencies among all eight locations (N = 174; M = 130.79; SD = 9.89), followed by participants in Puebla, Mexico (N = 128; M = 127.21; SD = 10.02). Respondents in Lyon, France, constituted the third group (N = 162; M = 126.21; SD = 8.93), and participants in Bristol, Great Britain, ranked fourth in overall mean score (N = 131; M = 122.85; SD = 9.24). Participants in Paris (N = 131; M = 122.24; SD = 10.43) comprised the fifth group, followed by respondents in Birmingham (N = 165; M = 118.05; SD = 10.02). Organizational members in Auckland, New Zealand, had the lowest power distance predispositions (N = 162; M = 113.48; SD = 8.49), while the second-lowest score was recorded among organizational members in Hamilton, New Zealand (N = 184; M = 116.39; SD = 9.45).

Although the overall score for France was higher than that for Great Britain, participants in Bristol had a slightly higher score than organizational members in Paris, without a statistically significant difference, F(1, 262) = 1.28; p = 0.05. In this case, male participants in Bristol reported higher perceptions of power distance (N = 131; M = 115.04; SD = 10.84) than those in Paris (N = 131; M = 112.88; SD = 8.92), which influenced the ranking observed in the present study.

Table 3: Power Distance Differences among Eight Locations in Four Countries

Countries	Number of Items/Possible score	Overall Mean Score (ranking)	Male Mean Score (ranking)	Female Mean Score (ranking)
Irapuato, Mexico*	40/200	130.79 (1)	132.72 (1)	128.24 (1)
Puebla, Mexico**	40/200	127.21 (2)	128.23 (2)	125.84 (2)
Lyon, France*	40/200	126.21 (3)	126.98 (3)	125.08 (3)
Paris, France**	40/200	122.24 (5)	123.68 (5)	122.09 (4)
Bristol, Great Britain*	40/200	122.85 (4)	123.84 (4)	121.06 (5)
Birmingham, Great Britain**	40/200	118.05 (6)	119.64 (6)	116.78 (6)
Hamilton, New Zealand*	40/200	116.39 (7)	117.98 (7)	113.82 (8)
Auckland, New Zealand**	40/200	113.48 (8)	113.29 (8)	114.49 (7)

Source: Calculated by the author. *a city with a population of less than 500,000 people. **city with more than 1,000,000 people in the population

Across all eight locations, female participants' power distance scores were lower than those of males in the same city, except in Auckland, New Zealand. Although this pattern was not observed in Hamilton, New Zealand, the higher scores for females than males in Auckland can be partially explained by the fact that high egalitarianism predominates in low power distance cultures, whereas low egalitarianism predominates in high power distance cultures (Gudykunst & Lee, 2003). This may have contributed to similar perspectives on power distance between men and women in New Zealand. New Zealand was, in fact, the first country in the world to grant women the right to vote in 1893 (CEDAW Report, 2010) and is currently ranked 9th out of a total of 144 countries in terms of women's gender equality (The Global Gender Gap Report, 2016). In the same report, Mexico is ranked 66th for gender equality, which may indicate lower levels of egalitarianism in the culture when compared with New Zealand and may represent one of the factors contributing to Mexico's classification as a high power distance country. It is also worthwhile to note that one Mexican female participant from Irapuato made a comment on the questionnaire, stating, "I was exposed to discrimination in my childhood at home and in school, and I grew up without self-confidence. Inequality was normal in my life, and I am scared of people with power." This participant marked "strongly agree" on 34 of the 40 questionnaire items.

Table 4 presents participants' perceptions and behavioral patterns of power distance across four levels of interaction. The analysis includes individual, family, organizational, and societal levels. At the individual level, female participants from Irapuato, Mexico, scored the highest (N = 79; M = 32.72; SD = 4.26), followed by the male group in the same city (N = 49; M = 32.01; SD = 3.98). The female group in Hamilton, New Zealand, recorded the lowest score (N = 78; M = 27.99; SD = 3.86), while the male group in Auckland, New Zealand, recorded the second lowest score (N = 102; M = 28.22; SD = 4.02). The individual-level item with the most significant mean score difference was "I usually have a great deal of respect for older people." For this item, male participants from Irapuato reported the highest mean score (N = 88; M = 3.98; SD = 0.52), whereas the female group in Hamilton reported the lowest score (N = 78; M = 2.64; SD = 0.39), with a statistically significant difference, F(1, 166) = 2.47; p = 0.060.

Interestingly, although individuals in specific professional occupations are considered to hold power in high power distance cultures (Fong & Chuang, 2004), higher education alone did not affect perceptions of power distance across all four countries. The individual-level item "I have a great deal of respect for people with higher education" did not show a significant difference across the eight locations. The highest score for this item was reported by the female group in Puebla (N = 49; M = 3.08; SD = 0.98), while the male group in Birmingham reported the lowest score (N = 92; M = 2.78; SD = 0.76), without statistically significant differences, F(1, 141) = 1.24; p = 0.05. This finding suggests that what individuals do with higher education may be more critical than simply possessing higher education, even in high power-distance cultures.

Table 4: Power Distance Mean Score Differences in Four Sub-Categories

Countries	Individual level* (male/female)	Family level* (male/female)	Organizational level* (male/female)	Societal level* (male/female)
Irapuato, Mexico**	32.01/32.72	33.23/31.96	34.24/30.78	33.24/32.78
Puebla, Mexico***	31.79/31.47	32.94/31.54	32.67/31.02	30.83/31.81
Lyon, France**	31.77/30.45	32.03/31.56	32.56/31.28	30.62/31.79
Paris, France***	29.43/28.78	31.22/30.65	30.59/30.89	30.57/31.77
Bristol, Great Britain**	30.92/30.27	31.88/31.02	30.24/30.27	30.80/29.50
Birmingham, Great Britain***	29.78/29.34	30.12/28.99	30.22/29.22	28.52/29.23
Hamilton, New Zealand**	28.29/27.99	29.35/28.85	30.24/29.02	30.10/27.96
Auckland, New Zealand***	28.22/28.35	29.32/28.12	28.56/29.51	27.19/28.51

Source: Calculated by the author, *Each category consists of 10 question items for a total of 50 possible points, **city with less than 500,000 people in the population, ***city with more than 1,000,000 people in the population

For the family-level power distance items, the male group in Irapuato recorded the highest score (N = 88; M = 33.23; SD = 3.69), followed by the male group in Puebla (N = 79; M = 32.94; SD = 5.49). These scores may be attributed to the fact that "Mexico has a huge central order of family that brings the society a sense of power, control, and influence" (Saenz, McGregor, & Nguyen, 2017, p. 229), and that families often maintain highly patriarchal contexts (Liu, Riosmena, & Creighton, 2018). In addition, French parents tend to emphasize their children's compliance and conformity to group values (Suizzo, 2002). In contrast, New Zealand parents emphasize a strong sense of independence in child development (Lee & Keown, 2018). One family-level questionnaire item asked participants, "Children should be taught not to question their parents' authority," and the item's scores were clearly consistent with family practices in these countries. For this item, the Mexican male group in Irapuato recorded the highest score (N = 88; M = 4.02; SD = 0.32), closely followed by the Mexican female group in Puebla (N = 49; M = 4.00; SD = 0.37). The lowest score for this item was reported by the New Zealand female group in Auckland (N = 61; M = 2.64; SD = 1.24), yielding a statistically significant difference when compared with the male group in Irapuato, F(1, 140) = 4.27; p = 0.05.

The third subcategory, the organizational level, produced similar scoring patterns, except that the female group in Auckland (N = 61; M = 29.51; SD = 3.87), the female group in Bristol (N = 50; M = 30.27; SD = 4.01), and the female group in Paris (N = 56; M = 30.89; SD = 3.34) scored slightly higher than the male groups in the same cities. The male group in Irapuato presented the highest mean score (N = 88; M = 34.24; SD = 5.29), followed by the male group in Puebla (N = 79; M = 32.67; SD = 4.89). One questionnaire item showing the most significant gap was observed between the male group in Puebla (N = 79; M = 3.92; SD = 1.02) and the female group in Hamilton (N = 78; M = 2.38; SD = 1.03), with a statistically significant difference, F(1, 157) = 2.48; p = 0.060. The item stated, "Everybody in a company accepts and respects all decisions made by the boss." The scores reported by participants across all four countries did not deviate from Hofstede's original ranking; however, the difference between participants from France (N = 293; M = 31.21; SD = 4.83) and Great Britain (N = 296; M = 30.20; SD = 4.57) was smaller than expected, F(1, 589) = 1.21; p = 0.05. Given the political, commercial, and cultural closeness between these two countries, further research should explore the factors contributing to the narrowing gap in cultural values.

The final subcategory, the societal level, produced outcomes similar to those observed in the other three levels of analysis. The male group from Irapuato recorded the highest score (N = 88; M = 33.24; SD = 6.02), while the lowest score was observed among male participants in Auckland (N = 102; M = 27.19; SD = 6.84). The item with the most significant score difference stated, "In this society, power is concentrated at the top rather than shared throughout the society." Mexican male participants from Irapuato reported the highest score on this item (N = 88; M = 4.01; SD = 0.59), whereas female respondents from Hamilton recorded the lowest mean score (N = 78; M = 3.10; SD = 0.78).

Although the findings aligned with Hofstede's original national ranking of the power distance dimension, the gaps among countries were narrower than expected, with no significant differences observed between France and Great Britain or between France and New Zealand. Based on the 40-item calculation, the total mean score for Mexican participants was 128.35, representing 64.18% of the possible 200 points. The French participants' score was 124.26 (62.13%), the British respondents' score was 120.76 (60.38%), and the New Zealand group's score was 115.34 (57.67%). These results indicate that gender and geographical location are influential factors in evaluating cultural values. Consequently, examining gender and location, along with age and occupation, may contribute to more accurate assessments of national standings on cultural value dimensions.

The reliability coefficient for the pilot study questionnaire items was $\alpha = 0.58$. Following modifications and improvements to the items, the reliability coefficient for the 40-item scale increased to $\alpha = 0.88$. For the subcategories, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were $\alpha = 0.89$ for individual-level items (inter-item correlations ranged from −0.02 to 0.39) and $\alpha = 0.88$ for family-

level items (inter-item correlations ranged from −0.01 to 0.42). For the remaining two subgroups, the reliability coefficients were α = 0.90 for organizational-level items, with inter-item correlations ranging from −0.01 to 0.34, and α = 0.87 for societal-level items, with inter-item correlations ranging from −0.02 to 0.33.

4. Discussion and Implications

Concerning Concerningion 1, the findings were generally consistent with HofsHofstede'sional rankings of the power distance index, indicating that individuals in Mexico and France continue to demonstrate behavioral and perceptual orientations associated with higher power distance. However, the scores reported by male participants from Paris, France, and Bristol, Great Britain, diverged from Hofstede's original classifications. These deviations suggest that culture should not be understood as a fixed, uniform construct but rather as a dynamic, evolving phenomenon. Such variation within traditionally categorized cultures highlights the importance of examining intra-national diversity and contextual influences when interpreting cultural value dimensions. Consequently, future research would benefit from a more profound exploration of how shifting social, economic, and institutional conditions reshape cultural perceptions of power over time.

The findings related to Research Question 2 further support this dynamic interpretation of culture. Both male and female participants from Paris and Bristol demonstrated deviations at the individual and family levels across the four subcategories of power distance. These results suggest that transformations in the private and interpersonal domains may precede, or even drive, broader cultural change. In France, contemporary shifts in family structures and intergenerational relations appear to be fostering more egalitarian patterns of authority and interaction. As French families increasingly negotiate power relations through shared decision-making and adaptive role expectations, both men and women may be internalizing more moderate power distance orientations. Similarly, the British findings indicate that localized social contexts can produce value orientations that differ from national-level expectations.

Taken together, these patterns point to an essential theoretical implication: power distance should be conceptualized not only as a national cultural characteristic but also as a multi-level and context-sensitive construct. The present study demonstrates that gender and geographic location within a country can meaningfully influence power distance orientations, thereby challenging the assumption of national homogeneity embedded in early cultural models. This insight contributes to the theoretical refinement of cultural dimensions by emphasizing the need to integrate micro-level social variables—such as gender roles, family dynamics, and local organizational norms—into models of cultural value formation. Incorporating additional factors, such as ethnicity, income, religion, and the intensity of intercultural exposure, into future studies may further illuminate the mechanisms by which cultural values evolve and diverge within national boundaries.

Although Hofstede's original cultural dimensions were derived primarily from data collected from a specific occupational group during a particular historical period, their enduring relevance lies in their heuristic value rather than their immutability. The objective of the present study was not to invalidate Hofstede's framework but to reassess its applicability under contemporary conditions. Given that culture is inherently dynamic, revisiting established cultural dimensions is both theoretically and practically necessary. As global interconnectedness intensifies across social, political, educational, and commercial domains, understanding how perceptions of power distance shift over time becomes increasingly essential for scholars and practitioners of intercultural communication.

The present findings suggest that while Hofstede's power distance dimension remains broadly applicable, the magnitude of differences between traditionally high- and low-power distance cultures has diminished. This observed "narrowing of cultural gaps" can be theoretically interpreted as the result of converging social practices driven by globalization, transnational mobility, expanded educational access, and evolving norms regarding authority and equality. Rather than signaling cultural homogenization, this convergence reflects selective adaptation, whereby societies retain core cultural values while recalibrating power relations in response to changing social realities. Thus, the narrowing gap should be understood as a process of cultural recalibration rather than cultural erosion.

5. Implications and Theoretical Contribution

Research on cultural values has long sought to clarify how cultural orientations shape communication, relationships, and social structures. As societies continue to evolve, cultural values likewise adapt in response to shifting social conditions. The findings of this study underscore the importance of approaching culture as a flexible, context-dependent construct rather than a rigid set of national traits. Accurate identification of the sources and influences of cultural differences remains essential for improving intercultural communication and interaction.

At the same time, the present findings caution against treating cultural dimensions as prescriptive rules for behavior. Despite extensive scholarly attention to culture, misunderstandings and oversimplifications persist regarding what culture represents and how it operates in practice. Therefore, the insights generated by this study should be applied thoughtfully, with recognition of cultural complexity and internal diversity. When cultural assumptions are replaced with empirically grounded, context-sensitive interpretations, individuals and organizations are better positioned to achieve effective, meaningful intercultural engagement.

This study advances intercultural communication theory by reconceptualizing power distance as a dynamic, multi-level, and context-sensitive construct rather than a static national attribute. While Hofstede's power distance dimension remains broadly valid at the macro level, the present findings demonstrate that its expression varies meaningfully across gender, geographic location, and interactional context. By empirically showing that deviations from national rankings occur most prominently at the individual and family levels, this study extends cultural dimensions theory beyond nation-centric explanations and highlights the importance of intra-cultural differentiation.

More importantly, the observed narrowing of power distance gaps among countries is theorized as a process of cultural recalibration, rather than convergence or homogenization. Cultural values do not simply weaken or disappear; instead, they are selectively adjusted in response to globalization, changing family structures, expanding education, and shifting norms of authority and equality. This perspective contributes to theory by explaining how enduring cultural frameworks can remain

relevant while accommodating social change. Accordingly, the study bridges classic dimensional models with contemporary intercultural realities, offering a refined theoretical lens that integrates stability and change in the study of cultural values.

6. Limitations of the Research

The present study was conducted with voluntary participants drawn from various organizations across four countries. As a result, organizational members do not constitute a fully representative sample of national populations, and the findings are limited to perceptions of power distance among employed individuals. Although gender and geographic location were examined as meaningful subdivisions, incorporating additional variables such as age, educational background, religious affiliation, and socioeconomic status could enhance the generalizability of future research.

Furthermore, the study relied exclusively on self-report questionnaire data to assess perceptions of power distance. While questionnaires are a well-established method for collecting information on social attitudes and behaviors, they are limited in their ability to capture the underlying reasons behind individuals' beliefs and actions. Future research would benefit from complementing survey methods with qualitative or observational approaches that allow for deeper examination of how power relations are enacted and negotiated in everyday interactions.

7. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to re-examine Hofstede's power distance dimension in a contemporary context by comparing organizational members across four countries included initially in Hofstede's research. The findings confirm that power distance continues to differentiate cultures at the national level, while also revealing that the magnitude of these differences has decreased and varies across social contexts. These results suggest that cultural values associated with power are not disappearing, but are being renegotiated through everyday practices in families, organizations, and local communities.

By demonstrating that gender and geographic location within countries influence power distance orientations, this study challenges assumptions of cultural homogeneity and underscores the need for more nuanced models of culture. The findings indicate that intercultural competence requires sensitivity not only to national differences but also to internal cultural diversity and contextual variation. As intercultural interactions become increasingly common, scholars and practitioners must move beyond rigid cultural classifications toward more flexible, evidence-based interpretations of cultural values.

In conclusion, Hofstede's power distance dimension remains a useful theoretical framework, but its application must reflect the evolving nature of culture. Re-examining cultural dimensions over time is essential for maintaining their theoretical relevance and practical utility. By offering empirical evidence of cultural recalibration and narrowing gaps in power distance, this study contributes to a more dynamic and contextually grounded understanding of culture in contemporary intercultural communication.

Acknowledgement Statement: The author would like to thank all participants and the reviewers for providing comments in helping this manuscript to completion.

Conflicts of interest: The author has no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Authors' contribution statements: Jung-Soo Yi performed the design of the study, writing, statistical analysis, conclusion, and implications.

Funding statements: This research was funded solely by the author. The expenses were minimal: copying paper questionnaires and postal fees for both ways.

Data availability statement: The data is available upon request. Please contact the corresponding author for any additional information on data access or usage.

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and contributor(s) and do not necessarily reflect JICC's or editors' official policy or position. All liability for harm done to individuals or property as a result of any ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content is expressly disclaimed.

References

Adler, N. J. (1997). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). South-Western College Publishing.

Andersen, P. (2000). Cues of culture: The basis of intercultural differences in nonverbal communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (9th ed., pp. 258–270). Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Ayyash-Abdo, H. (2001). Individualism and collectivism: The case of Lebanon. *Social Behavior and Personality, 29*(5), 503–518. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2001.29.5.503

Beamer, L., & Varner, I. (2001). *Intercultural communication in the global workplace* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Beugelsdijk, S., & Welzel, C. (2018). Dimensions and dynamics of national culture: Synthesizing Hofstede with Inglehart. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 49*(10), 1469–1505. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022118798505

Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (1994). Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*(2), 233–257. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022194252005

Borden, G. A. (1991). *Cultural orientation: An approach to understanding intercultural communication*. Prentice Hall.

Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. In H. C. Triandis & H. W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Methodology* (pp. 389–444). Allyn & Bacon.

Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M. J., Francesco, A. M., Chen, Z. X., Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gomez, C., Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). Culture and procedural justice: The moderating influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*(4), 300–315. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2000.1451

Bullinger, M. (2003). International comparability of health interview surveys: An overview of methods and approaches. In A. Nosikov & C. Gudex (Eds.), *EUROHIS: Developing standard instruments for health surveys* (pp. 1–11). IOS Press.

Calzada, E. J., Fernández, Y., & Cortés, D. E. (2010). Incorporating the cultural value of respeto into a framework of Latino parenting. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*(1), 77–86. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016071

CEDAW Report. (2010). *New Zealand's seventh report on its implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*. Ministry of Women's Affairs.

Chen, G., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Allyn & Bacon.

Choi, J., Kushner, K. E., Mill, J., & Lai, D. W. L. (2012). Understanding the language, the culture, and the experience: Translation in cross-cultural research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 11*(5), 652–665. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691201100508

Cook, T. B. (2023, February 1). *The United Kingdom: Its cultural dimensions and cultural values*. TBC Culture Hub. https://www.tbcculturehub.com/post/the-united-kingdom-its-cultural-dimensions-and-cultural-values

Cooper, P. J., Calloway-Thomas, C., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). *Intercultural communication: A text with readings*. Allyn & Bacon.

Cortina, K. S., Arel, S., & Smith-Darden, J. P. (2017). School belonging in different cultures: The effect of individualism and power distance. *Frontiers in Education, 2*, Article 56. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2017.00056

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. Wadsworth Group.

Cronbach, L. J. (1946). Response sets and test validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 6*(4), 475–494. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316444600600405

Daniels, M. A., & Greguras, G. J. (2014). Exploring the nature of power distance: Implications for micro- and macro-level theories, processes, and outcomes. *Journal of Management, 40*(5), 1202–1229. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527131

Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(5), 851–864. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.5.851

DiMaggio, P. (1997). Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*(1), 263–287. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.263

Drolet, A. L., & Morrison, D. G. (2001). Do we really need multiple-item measures in service research? *Journal of Service Research, 3*(3), 196–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/109467050133001

Erez, M. (2011). Cross-cultural and global issues in organizational psychology. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 807–854). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-023

Fisher, R. (2009). Where is culture in cross-cultural research? An outline of a multi-level research process for measuring culture as a shared meaning system. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 9*(1), 25–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808101154

Fong, M., & Chuang, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Communicating ethnic and cultural identity*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. https://doi.org/10.5040/9798216405191

Ghosh, A. (2011). Power distance in organizational contexts: A review of collectivist cultures. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 47*(1), 89–101.

Gong, W., Li, Z. G., & Stump, R. L. (2007). Global internet and access: Cultural considerations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 19*(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1108/13555850710720902

Gudykunst, W. B., Gao, G., Schmidt, K. L., Nishida, T., Bond, M. H., Wang, G., & Barraclough, R. A. (1992). The influence of individualism-collectivism, self-monitoring, and predicted-outcome value on communication in in-group and out-group relationships. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23*(2), 196–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022192232005

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Lee, C. M. (2003). Cross-cultural communication theories. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and intercultural communication* (pp. 7–34). SAGE Publications.

Hauff, S., & Richter, N. (2015). Power distance and its moderating role in the relationship between situational job characteristics and job satisfaction: An empirical analysis using different cultural measures. *Cross-Cultural Management, 22*(1), 68–89. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCM-11-2013-0164

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. SAGE Publications.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive, 7*(1), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1993.9409142061

Hofstede, G. (1998). Attitudes, values, and organizational culture: Disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies, 19*(3), 477–493. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069801900305

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Holden, N. (2004). Why marketers need a new concept of culture for the global knowledge economy. *International Marketing Review, 21*(6), 563–572. https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330410568015

Horan, P. M., DiStefano, C., & Motl, R. W. (2003). Wording effects in self-esteem scales: Methodological artifact or response style? *Structural Equation Modeling, 10*(3), 435–455. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1003_6

Houchin, C., & Wild, D. (2006, August). *The translation and linguistic validation of the Impact of Weight on Quality of Life (IWQoL-LITE) questionnaire* [Paper presentation]. International Conference of the International Society for Quality of Life Research, Lisbon, Portugal.

Inkeles, A., & Levinson, D. J. (1969). National character: The study of modal personality and sociocultural systems. In G. Lindzey & F. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 4, pp. 418–499). Addison-Wesley.

Javidan, M., & House, R. J. (2001). Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*(4), 289–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(01)00034-1

Jippes, M., & Majoor, G. D. (2011). Influence of national culture on the adoption of integrated medical curricula. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 16*(1), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-010-9236-5

Keillor, B. D., & Hult, G. T. M. (1999). A five-country study of national identity: Implications for international marketing research and practice. *International Marketing Review, 16*(1), 65–82. https://doi.org/10.1108/02651339910257656

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review, 110*(2), 265–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265

Khatri, N. (2009). Consequences of power distance orientation in organizations. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective, 13*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/097226290901300101

Kim, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2014). The impact of power-distance belief on consumers' preference for status brands. *Journal of Global Marketing, 27*(1), 13–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/08911762.2013.844290

Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J.-L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(4), 744–764. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.43669971

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(3), 557–569. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069370

Klopf, D. W. (1998). *Intercultural encounters: The fundamentals of intercultural communication* (4th ed.). Morton Publishing Company.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Row, Peterson.

Klyukanov, I. E. (2005). *Principles of intercultural communication*. Pearson Education.

Lee, B., & Keown, L. J. (2018). Challenges and changes in the parenting experiences of Korean immigrants in New Zealand. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal, 27*(4), 431–450. https://doi.org/10.1177/0117196818810112

Liu, M., Riosmena, F., & Creighton, M. J. (2018). Sibling position, gender, and family networks in Mexican and Senegalese migration. *Population, Space and Place, 24*(6), e2138. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2161

Lu, L., Rose, G. M., & Blodgett, J. G. (1999). The effects of cultural dimensions on ethical decision making in marketing: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Ethics, 18*(1), 91–105. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006038012256

Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2006). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.

Madlock, P. E. (2012). The influence of power distance and communication on Mexican workers. *International Journal of Business Communication, 49*(2), 169–184. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943612436973

Malhotra, S. (2021). A cross-cultural study of consumer decision making in India and France. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal, 25*(5), 1–8.

Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). *Intercultural communication in contexts* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

McCornack, S. (2010). *Reflect & relate: An introduction to interpersonal communication*. Bedford/St. Martin's.

McSweeney, B. (2000, July 9–11). *The fallacy of national culture identification* [Paper presentation]. 6th Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Accounting Conference, Manchester, United Kingdom.

Neuliep, J. W. (2015). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Yim, F. H. K. (2009). Does the job satisfaction–job performance relationship vary across cultures? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40*(5), 761–796. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022109339208

Orr, L. M., & Hauser, W. J. (2008). A re-inquiry of Hofstede's cultural dimensions: A call for the 21st century. *Marketing Management Journal, 18*(2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.63963/001c.150943

Ozolins, U. (2008). Issues of back translation methodology in medical translations. In *Proceedings of the FIT XVIII World Congress* (pp. 1–9). International Federation of Translators.

Paquin, A. R., Roch, S. G., & Sanchez-Ku, M. L. (2007). An investigation of cross-cultural differences on the impact of productivity interventions: The example of ProMES. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43*(4), 427–448. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886307307346

Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (Eds.). (1951). *Toward a general theory of action*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674863507

Pasa, S. F. (2000). Leadership influence in a high power distance and collectivist culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21*(8), 414–426. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730010379258

Patrick, H. A., & Kumar, V. R. (2012). Managing workplace diversity: Issues and challenges. *SAGE Open, 2*(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244012444615

Peterson, M. F. (2003). [Review of the book *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.), by G. Hofstede]. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(1), 127–131. https://doi.org/10.2307/3556622

Rafiei, S., & Pourreza, A. (2013). The moderating role of power distance on the relationship between employee participation and outcome variables. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 1*(1), 79–83. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2013.12

Redpath, L., & Nielsen, M. O. (1997). A comparison of native culture, non-native culture, and new management ideology. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 14*(3), 327–339. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00139.x

Russell, B. (1938). *Power: A new social analysis*. Allen & Unwin.

Saenz, M. G., McGregor, T., & Nguyen, M. (2017). A cross-cultural examination of the United States, Argentina, and Mexico using Hofstede's dimensions and the World Values Survey. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review, 7*(2), 227–236.

Sagie, A., & Aycan, Z. (2003). A cross-cultural analysis of participative decision-making in organizations. *Human Relations, 56*(4), 453–473. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726703056004003

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (2001). *Communication between cultures* (4th ed.). Wadsworth.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., McDaniel, E. R., & Roy, C. S. (2017). *Communication between cultures*(9th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Schmitt, N., & Stults, D. M. (1985). Factors defined by negatively keyed items: The result of inattentive respondents? *Applied Psychological Measurement, 9*(4), 367–373. https://doi.org/10.1177/014662168500900405

Scholtens, B., & Dam, L. (2007). Cultural values and international differences in business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 75*(3), 273–284. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9252-9

Signorini, P., Wiesemes, R., & Murphy, R. (2009). Developing alternative frameworks for exploring intercultural learning: A critique of Hofstede's cultural difference model. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(3), 253–264. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510902898825

Sivasubramaniam, D., & Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2011). Trust and power-distance: A psychological perspective on fairness in restorative justice conferences. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 18*(2), 203–219. https://doi.org/10.1375/pplt.13.2.203

Smith, P. B. (2002). Culture's consequences: Something old and something new. *Human Relations, 55*(1), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055001603

Søndergaard, M. (1994). Hofstede's consequences: A study of reviews, citations, and replications. *Organization Studies, 15*(3), 447–456. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069401500307

Sonderen, E., Sanderman, R., & Coyne, J. C. (2013). Ineffectiveness of reverse wording of questionnaire items: Let's learn from cows in the rain. *PLOS ONE, 8*(7), e68967. https://doi.org/10.1371/annotation/af78b324-7b44-4f89-b932-e851fe04a8e5

Sorrells, K. (2013). *Intercultural communication: Globalization and social justice*. SAGE Publications.

Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2001). The role of national culture in international marketing research. *International Marketing Review, 18*(1), 30–44. https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330110381970

Suizzo, M.-A. (2002). French parents' cultural models and child-rearing beliefs. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26*(4), 297–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250143000175

Tang, Y., Huang, X., & Wang, Y. (2017). Good marriage at home, creativity at work: Family–work enrichment effect on workplace creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38*(5), 749–766. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2175

Terzi, A. R. (2004). A research on power distance and uncertainty avoidance of university students' perceptions. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversity Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(1), 65–75.

The Global Gender Gap Report. (2016). World Economic Forum. Retrieved July 18, 2019, from https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-gender-gap-report-2016

Thomas, D. C. (2008). *Cross-cultural management: Essential concepts* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Wayne, J. H., Michel, J. S., & Matthews, R. A. (2022). Balancing work and family: A theoretical explanation and longitudinal examination of its relation to spillover and role functioning. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 107*(7), 1094–1114. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001007

Westby, C. (2007). Child maltreatment: A global issue. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 38*(2), 140–148. https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2007/014)

Wu, M. (2006). Hofstede's cultural dimensions 30 years later: A study of Taiwan and the United States. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 15*(1), 33–42.

Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W., & Peng, T. K. (2007). Procedural justice climate and group power distance: An examination of cross-level interaction effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 681–692. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.681

Yi, J. (2004). Individualism-collectivism: A geographical comparison among cities in Korea and the United States. *The Journal of Language for International Business, 15*(1), 19–34.

Yildirim, B., & Deniz, A. (2014). The relationship between power distance and organizational commitment in primary schools. *Educational Research and Reviews, 9*(12), 750–760. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2014.1869

Yoo, A. J. (2014). The effects of Hofstede's cultural dimensions on student-teacher relationships in the Korean context. *Journal of International Education Research, 10*(2), 171–178. https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v10i2.8519

Yuan, F., & Zhou, J. (2015). Effects of cultural power distance on group creativity and individual group member creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(7), 990–1007. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2022

Zhang, Y., & Begley, T. M. (2011). Power distance and its moderating impact on empowerment and team participation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(17), 3601–3617. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.560877

Zhao, B., & Pan, Y. (2017). Cross-cultural employee motivation in international companies. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies, 5*(4), 215–222. https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2017.54019

Zheng, J. (2010). Cross-cultural study on French and Chinese managers' use of power sources. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(5), 219–225. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n5p219

About the author(s)

Jung-Soo Yi is a professor in the School of Social Sciences and International Studies at Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio. He received his PhD in speech communication from Pennsylvania State University. He teaches courses in public speaking, organizational communication, intercultural communication, and negotiation and bargaining communication.

Appendix

Ranking of Forty Countries on Power Distance

Ranking *	Country	Ranking*	Country	Ranking *	Country	Ranking*	Country
1	Philippines	11	Turkey	21	Pakistan	**31**	Germany
2	**Mexico ****	12	Belgium	22	Japan	32	**Great**
3	Venezuela	13	Peru	23	Italy	33	**Britain ****
4	India	14	Thailand	24	South	34	Switzerland
5	Yugoslavia	15	Chile	25	Africa	35	Finland
6	Singapore	16	Portugal	26	Argentina	36	Norway
7	Brazil	17	Greece	27	U.S.A.	**37**	Sweden
8	Hong Kong	18	Iran	28	Canada	38	Ireland
9	**France ****	19	Taiwan	29	Netherlands	39	**New**
10	Colombia	20	Spain	30	Australia	40	**Zealand ****
							Denmark
							Israel
							Austria

*A high ranking means the country can be classified as one that prefers a large power distance; a low ranking is associated with cultures that prefer a small power distance. ** Four countries participated in this research.

Source: Adapted from Geert Hofstede, Culture's Consequences: International differences in Work-Related Values (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980)